

modern language notes

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

APR 22 1955

PERIODICAL
READING ROOM

VOL. LXX, NO. 4, APRIL 1955

- 235 Pulpit Rhetoric in Three Canterbury Tales. C. E. SHAIN
- 245 The Unity of Chaucer's Manciple Fragment. MORTON DONNER
- 249 A Middle-English Poem on the Seven Gifts of the Holy Ghost.
R. H. BOWERS
- 252 Lydgate's "Halff Chongyd Latyne": An Illustration.
ISABEL HYDE
- 254 Sidney's Classical Meters. JAMES APPLIGATE
- 256 Thomson's "Ode on the Winter Solstice." R. M. WILLIAMS
- 257 Fielding and Dr. Samuel Clarke. A. R. TOWERS
- 261 Southey and the *Quarterly Review*. N. L. KADERLY
- 263 *Adam Bede*: Arthur Donnithorne and Zeluco. JEROME THALE
- 265 Source of the Word "Agnostic." G. W. HALLAM
- 269 The Murders of Doyle and Eliot. CONSTANCE NICHOLAS
- 272 Simms's Porgy and Cooper. E. F. VANDIVER, JR.
- 274 Emerson as a Creator of Vignettes. C. F. STRAUCH
- 279 Two Uses of Maupassant by R. P. Warren. J. T. STEWART
- 280 A Footnote to Caroline's Letter of April 4, 1786. R. L. KAHN
- 280 Old French *sancier*, *essancier*. C. H. LIVINGSTON
- 283 Some Unpublished Letters of Emile Deschamps, Public Functionary and Private Citizen. AARON SCHAFER
- 289 *Fragments* by Jean Giraudoux. LAURENT LE SAGE

REVIEWS

- 292 ALFRED HARBAGE, *Shakespeare and the Rival Traditions* (CLIFFORD LEECH)
- 295 JOHN ARTHOS, *On "A Mask Presented at Ludlow-Castle"* (W. B. HUNTER, JR.)
- 296 HAROLD JENKINS, *Edward Benlowes (1602-1676)* (J. B. LEISHMAN)
- 298 J. W. BOWYER, *The Celebrated Mrs. Centlivre* (JOHN LOFTIS)
- 299 D. V. ERDMAN, *Blake: Prophet against Empire* (R. F. GLECKNER)
- 302 ABBIE FINDLAY POTTS, *Wordsworth's Prelude* (J. W. BEACH)
- 305 LEO VILLIGER, *Catharina Regina von Greiffenberg (1633-1694)* (G. SCHULZ-BEHREND)
- 305 ADOLF RAPP, ed., *Briefwechsel zwischen Strauss und Vischer, Zweiter Band, 1851-1873* (ERNST FEISE)
- 307 MICHELE BARBI, *Life of Dante*, tr. and ed. P. G. RUGGIERI. *The Purgatorio from the Divine Comedy*, tr. SYDNEY FOWLER WRIGHT (A. L. PELLEGRINI)
- 308 W. L. WILEY, *The Gentleman in Renaissance France* (R. J. CLEMENTS)
- 312 BENOIT, *Chronique des ducs de Normandie, Vol. II*, ed. CARIN FAHLIN (ALFRED FOULET)

modern language notes

KEMP MALONE,
General Editor

DON CAMERON ALLEN

CHARLES R. ANDERSON

ANNA HATCHER

WILLIAM H. MCCLAIN

GEORGES POULET

BRUCE W. WARDROPPER

EARL R. WASSERMAN

S. K. HENINGER, JR.,
Secretary

Published eight times annually, November through June. Subscription: \$6.00 in the United States; \$6.25 in Canada; \$6.50 in other countries. Single issue, \$1.00. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore 18, Md.

Contributors and publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to *Modern Language Notes*, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore 18, Md. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped return envelope. In preparing manuscripts, contributors are requested to follow the MLA Style Sheet.

Entered as Second-class Matter at the Baltimore, Md., Postoffice. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Sec. 1103, Act of Congress, 16 July 1894.

(a)

873

om

(r)

ough

\$6.25

1.00.

ould

Md.

ripts

The

very

turn

are

Md.

e of

green,

END)

-1873

from

ULET)

through
; \$6.25
\$, \$1.00.
should
8, Md.

ascripts
The
Every
return
om are

c, Md.,
rate of
ongres,

P

sec
ste
tio
sin
clo
to
pul
the
the
for
Ch

in
era
Bu
lea
ma
wa

et
tion
Pre
is
mor

VOL

modern language notes

VOL. LXX, NO. 4, APRIL 1955

Pulpit Rhetoric in Three Canterbury Tales

The effort to place Chaucer within and without the traditions of secular rhetoric of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries goes on steadily since Manly first caught sight of this interesting investigation in Faral's editions of the texts of the chief rhetoricians.¹ A similar but it would seem less compelling interest appears in another closely related aspect of Chaucer studies as medievalists have brought to light more of the manuals and sermons of the rhetoricians of the pulpit. The publications in 1932 and 1936 by Gilson and Charland, the studies of Owst and the editing of the fifty-one sermons from the British Museum Ms Royal 18 B have given us new assistance for studying Chaucer's relation to the voice of his church.² Although Chaucer has made no allusion to a *Gaufred, deere maister soverayn* in the realm of preaching, no one will want to dissent from the generally held opinion that he was steeped in the lore of pulpit rhetoric. But will it appear justifiable to say, as some earlier critics have at least suggested, that he had a student's knowledge of the preachers' manuals as he had of the tracts of the secular rhetoricians? Chaucer was a writer, not a preacher, and should we look for model or even

¹ J. M. Manly, *Chaucer and the Rhetoricians* (London, 1926).

² E. Gilson, *Michel Menot et la Technique du Sermon Medieval, Les Idées et les Lettres* (Paris, 1932); Th.-M. Charland, *Artes Praedicandi: Contribution à l'histoire de la Rhétorique au Moyen Âge* (Paris, 1936); G. R. Owst, *Preaching in Medieval England* (Cambridge, 1926); *Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England* (Cambridge, 1933); W. O. Ross, *Middle English Sermons* (EETS #209, 1940).

typical sermons in the *Canterbury Tales* any more than we should want to find a model Pardoner or a typical Friar? But Chaucer had inevitably to make use of that powerful and pervasive instrument of medieval culture, the sermon, and it will be my purpose here to examine some of the ways in which he knew and used sermon techniques and sermon makers.

The two best known preachers among the Canterbury Pilgrims are the Pardoner and the Parson. Twenty-five years ago in a series of articles Chapman recommended that their tales should be read as typical sermon structures.³ Perhaps it will serve a purpose to record here that the errors in Chapman's articles have since been pointed out. Carleton Brown's edition of the *Pardoner's Tale* shows how few of the conditions of systematic sermon structure are respected by that famous preacher, and how badly what the Pardoner said needs to be wrenched to make his sermon fit those conventions that remain.⁴ It is easier, as Brown notes, to find prototypes for the structure of the tale in the old homily collections, and Ross's edition of the *Ms Royal sermons* illustrates that the older, freer method of sermon making that the treatises called the "ancient" type were current and popular in Chaucer's time. The *Pardoner's Tale* is a sermon, but our understanding of it is not improved when we are asked to note "the excellent structure of the tale as a whole, according to medieval principles of preaching."⁵

Unless we use the term sermon very loosely, and if we do not insist, as Chapman did again, that the *Parson's Tale* is in "strict accordance with sermon structure," what the Parson told cannot be called a sermon.⁶ It has been shown that the basic structure of the last tale should not be assumed to be "a sermon on Penitence, in which is embodied a long treatise, originally separate, on the Deadly sins."⁷ The organization of the "sermon" and the inclusion of the Deadly Sins within the "terms" of Penitence is a sequence frequently found in the medieval manuals of religious instruction.⁸ The

³ C. O. Chapman, "The Pardoner's Tale: A Medieval Sermon," *MLN*, xli (1926), 506-509. "The Parson's Tale: A Medieval Sermon," *MLN*, xlii (1928), 229-234. "Chaucer on Preachers and Preaching," *PMLA*, xlii (1928), 178-185.

⁴ *The Pardoner's Tale*, ed. C. Brown (Oxford, 1935), p. xii.

⁵ Chapman, *op. cit.*, *PMLA*, xli, 509.

⁶ Chapman, *op. cit.*, *MLN*, xlii, 229.

⁷ F. N. Robinson, *Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* (Boston, 1933), p. 873.

⁸ H. G. Pfander, "Some Medieval Manuals of Religious Instruction in

tale, as Pfander points out, contains devices for amplification so common to all religious exposition that they cannot be called peculiar to sermons. The true genre of the *Parson's Tale* is the religious manual.

Chapman's work would perhaps have been more valuable if he had made a more modest claim for Chaucer's knowledge of the preachers and their *artes praedicandi*: that Chaucer implies more knowledge by the way he breaks the rules of sermon making than by the way he keeps them. Let us look at the *Pardoner's Tale* by beginning from Carleton Brown's hypothesis that the Pardoner's sermon is an artful blending of two sermon or exemplum sources, the first on the Sins of the Tavern and the second on his announced theme, *Radix Malorum est Cupiditas*. Brown believed that for the homiletic beginning of the tale up to the introduction of the three rioters Chaucer drew from one source and perhaps had originally intended this part of the tale for a different teller, the Parson. For this hypothesis he presents the following arguments: that the Pardoner is not here preaching on his announced and obsessive theme of avarice; that he will not "win" people to buy pardons and relics by dilating the sins of the tavern—"Has he, for the time being, completely forgotten salesmanship?"—; that the abrupt introduction of *Thise riotours thre, of whiche I telle*, is not prepared for by the tavern scene and hence must be a seam that Chaucer allowed to show when he joined the two sources; that none of the analogues of the Robbers and the Treasure begins with a tavern scene; and, finally, that several tavern-scene exempla were available to furnish Chaucer with the source material of the first homily. These are strong arguments, especially the latter ones, and this explanation of the genesis of the *Pardoner's Tale* is attractive because it shows us Chaucer's eye for materials and his control over sources. But I believe that certain objections can be raised to Brown's case where it rests on the incongruities he finds in the Pardoner's sermon. If these are not true objections they will at least serve to emphasize that Chaucer's knowledge of sermon dialectic must not be restricted to the rules, or even to surface consistencies.

Brown has already dismissed the *Prologue* and *Tale* as a formal sermon. He might have characterized the Sins of the Tavern section as being completely formless according to any of the rules of the sermon treatises. Despite the announced "theme," there is no

England and Observations on Chaucer's *Parson's Tale*," *JEGP*, xxxv (1936), 243-258.

theme here; there is instead a tavern scene. Since there is no theme, there can be no protheme, no reintroduction of theme, no division, no subdivision; in short, no sermon; for the relation of parts to the whole is the essence of medieval sermon making. The Pardoner relates his parts in a very elementary way, by adding one to the other:

And now that I have spoken glotonye,
Now wol I yow deffenden hasardrye.

589-590

He finds it sufficient to introduce gluttony by a rhetorical apostrophe that recalls to his listeners what they must have heard many times before, that Adam was the first glutton. He leads his audience quite simply from one stock response to the next, counting on their recognizing the symbols and commonplaces of a market-day evangelist. His voice, of which Chaucer makes so much, will provide all the necessary relationship between "parts." We can follow the sermon from climax to climax, through the pathos of Christ and the *saffron* of *glosynge*, through the glamour provided by his historical examples to the vivid details of the dice game and the village drunk. The only method the Pardoner can be described as using is a *mélange* of all the methods. Like an accomplished monologist who collects a repertoire from histrionic styles, the Pardoner has collected congenial bits from all the preaching he has heard and combined them with glittering ease. He can "multiply authorities" as every preacher must; he can "mark the opposite" (574-578), and slip in a pun for sheer delight and then repeat it. He knows how to sound specific and "textuel" ("Not Samuel, but Lamuel, seye I"), and when to be suggestive and ambiguous (the story of Attila, he suggests, has Biblical authority). It is especially noticeable how cleverly he can slide from general terms to modern "proofs."

In whom that drynke hath dominacioun
He kan no conseil *kepe*, it is no drede.
Now *kepe* yow fro the white and fro the rede,
And namely fro the white wyn of Lepe . . .
(my italics)

560-563

The method is to accumulate effects, to ring as many changes as possible. For the Pardoner's purpose "is yet and ever was" not to dilate the theme of avarice, as Brown seems to take it, but it was the purpose of any preacher, to

maken oother folk to *twynne*
From avarice, and *soore to repente.*
(my italics)

430-431

If we suppose that what Chaucer took from one exemplum was just the setting, a tavern in Flanders, is it true that "the earlier portion of the *Pardoner's Tale* presents a somewhat puzzling problem through its lack of real connection with what precedes and follows"? The Pardoner knows what a good story he is leading up to. He knows his audience and what will win them to his pardons. His best selling point is to deliver a detailed account of the sinner's state, and therein lies his salesmanship. If he can embroil both his audience and the three rioters in the deadly sins of the tavern, will he not carry them together into the contrastingly quiet country of "this false traytour Deeth" and the discovery of the gold florins? Most readers, I suppose, are not bothered that the rioters are brought in from nowhere, for, at the end of the homilie, the pace and tone has changed for us, as for the Pardoner's audience. The nightclub of the opening lines has long since disappeared and we are in a country tavern in plague time. The only noise is a clink of a bell from a funeral procession. Later when the Pardoner has brought his exemplum to a quick and quiet end, how completely he has prepared for his peroration!

O cursed synne of alle cursednesse!
O traytours homycide, O wikkednesse!
O glotonye, luxurie, and hasardrye!
Thou blasphemour of Crist with vileynye
And othes grete, of usage and of pride!

895-899

The identification of the audience and the rioters is fulfilled:

Allas! mankynde, how may it bitide
That to thy creatour, which that the wroghte,
And with his precious herte-blood thee boghte,
Thou art so fals and so unkynde, alas?

900-903

If the two parts of the Pardoner's homily can be harmonized in this way, it may be that we make an original mistake in this tale, and in others where sermon materials are used, to read Chaucer's sermon patterns and sermon rhetoric as if he were applying rules (and sources) directly. For instance, I do not know what Brown means when he calls the first part of the Pardoner's Tale "a syste-

* Brown, *op. cit.*, p. xv.

matic exposition of the sins of the tavern."¹⁰ Is it systematic because it treats of closely related sins and dilates them using some of the approved rhetorical devices? But more than this is involved in the *concept* of a sermon. It was Chaucer's knowledge of what the emotional impact of a sermon should be, of what would make the Pardoner's audience cry "I repent," which is the system we should talk about, if we can.

Some elements of pulpit rhetoric can perhaps be isolated. The presence of symbolism in preaching was more than a preacher's device or a habit of exposition. It was a method of conception for the speaker and the listener both. Through symbolism the preacher appealed to his audience and involved them in his preaching. It was by following closely the "figures" of the sermon that the audience could participate in the preacher's most serious purposes. In sermon 39 from the Ms Royal 18 B collection the preacher is warning against being too inquisitive concerning miracles. He says, "First lat vs keuer þe face of oure vndirstondyng with þe sudare of feyþthe, þat we wavere not in non article of our feyþthe but fully byleve him."¹¹ In sermon 40 another preacher warns against the "myscheff spirituell drokenness druveþ mannes in." Then he begins to expand his metaphor: with the drink of pride men get blind-drunk; like the bat who is blind because the "humour" that should have given him sight has passed to his leathery wings, so God's light is taken from proud men's eyes and their strength passes into the wings of pride and ambition.¹² Instances of figurative language could be multiplied many times in sermon collections. It could be shown, I suspect, that the use of concise and rapid imagery flourished first in English in the rhetorical traditions of the pulpit and had its greatest influence from that origin. Chaucer's Pardoner handles images with great familiarity:

To kyndle and blowe the fyr of lecherye,	481
Whan man so drynketh of the white and rede	
That of his throte he maketh his pryvee,	526-527
For dronkenesse is verray sepulture	
Of mannes wit and his discrecioun.	558-559
That vengeance shal nat parten from his hous	
That of his othes is to outrageous.	649-650

¹⁰ Brown, *op. cit.*, p. xv.

¹¹ Ross, *op. cit.*, p. 223.

¹² Ross, *op. cit.*, pp. 230-232.

Chaucer puts very characteristic figures into the mouth of the cleric from whom we can learn more about Chaucer's knowledge of preaching than from any other character, the Summoner's *lymytour*.

in prechyng [he says] is my diligence,
And studie in Petres wordes and in Poules.
I walke, and fissue Christen mennes soules,
To yelden Jhesu Crist his propre rente; 1818-1821

Later when he thinks he has pumped Thomas full of exempla against ire, he clinches his case with

Hoold nat the develes knyf ay at thyn herte- 2091

The *lymytour's* images are so appropriately pat that we miss an element of the flavor of his preaching, as against the Pardoner's, if we do not see the difference in their figures. The *Merchant's Tale*, designed for a cleric, and told, as we shall see, in the pattern of a sermon, uses metaphors extended only a little way from their Biblical origins.

And namely whan a man is cold and hoor;
Thanne is a wyf the fruyt of his tresor. 1269-1270

And trewely it sit wel to be so,
That bacheloris have often peyne and wo;
On brotel ground they buylde, and brotelnesse
They fynde, whan they wene sikernesse. 1277-1281

The Wife of Bath, inveterate church-goer, is also a *noble prechour in this cas*. In her defense of marriage, when she is meeting contrary theological opinions, she naturally resorts to figurative language as well as to scriptural authorities: a lord's household contains wooden vessels as well as gold; Christ is a well of perfection; and

I wol bistowe the flour of al myn age
In the actes and in fruyt of mariage. 113-114

In the little homiletic tag with which the Friar completes his tale of the Devil and the Summoner, there is room enough for a figurative quotation from the Psalms and an allusion to Christ, "youre champion and knyght."

Before leaving this aspect of the language of preaching, it should be noted that the Summoner's begging friar makes notable use of the devices of secular rhetoric in his preaching, and from this example we may suppose that Chaucer knew that sprightly and sophisticated preachers were characterized by their frequent use of that

other tradition of eloquence. Chaucer loads the *lymytour's* defense of friars with such a weight of rhetorical devices as to make clear that he wanted to call attention to them. There are instances of balance (1872-1874, 1877-1878); contrast (1979); play on words (1916-1917); a Latin pun (1934); a rhetorical question (1935-1938); similies (1930-1938); a typical rhetorical listing (1907-1910); and an example of the I-won't-say-anymore-but-I-could formula.

It is also this friar who draws our attention to a larger aspect of the symbolic language that stands at the center of the *artes praedicandi* when he says:

I have to day been at youre chirche at messe,
And seyde a sermon after my symple wit,
Nat al after the text of hooly writ;
For it is hard to yow, as I suppose,
And therefore wol I teche yow al the glose.
Glosynge is a glorious thyng, certeyn,
For lettre sleeth, so as we clerkes seyn. 1788-1794

Glosynge can mean, of course, not just the interpretation of difficult passages, but the expounding of Scripture into its four senses. Chapman is stating the obvious when he says that "This practice must have been known by name even to laymen."¹³ It is much more significant that the pilgrims, especially the laymen, knew and used a second meaning of the word, to dissemble, to deceive, to tell a flat falsehood (Merchant 2351; Squire 166; Manciple 34). Chaucer had used it in this pejorative sense in the *Legend of Good Women* (G254) in the *Romaunt of the Rose* (5097) and in a gloss in *Boece* (Bk. 2, p. 3, l. 71). It is Troilus who gives us Chaucer's use of this sense which most directly relates it to a certain kind of silver tongue in the pulpit. He is warning Criseyde of the wiles of her father:

Ye shal ek sen, youre fader shal yow glose
To ben a wyf, and as he kan wel preche,
He shal som Grek so preyse and wel alose,
That ravysshenn he shal yow with his speche, T&C 4.1471-1475

The serious context of Troilus's pulpit metaphor and Chaucer's interest in his portrait of the *glosynge* Friar may not, in the absence of other evidence, substantiate the opinion that Chaucer had taken a Wyclifian stand on Bible literalism, but we are aware of an atti-

¹³ Chapman, *op. cit.*, *PMLA*, XLIV, 181.

tude toward the pulpit art of *glosynge*. The secular rhetorician did not have recourse to a method of persuasion as flexible or as powerful as this one.

After we have looked at the *Pardoner's Tale* and the *Summoner's Tale* to see sermon conceptions that Chaucer has used there, if then we look at the beginning of the *Merchant's Tale*, we can see a pattern of sermon structures and techniques repeated. Even without the tell-tale vestiges of a clerical narrator, the *Merchant's Tale* betrays a preaching background. The inference of this similarity of pattern may be that when Chaucer shaped his tales to a preacher's telling he had ready to his hand mannerisms of pulpit exposition which would provoke the desired response from his audience and establish a conventional frame for his story. Why has Chaucer evoked the preacher and his methods in the *Merchant's Tale* and what use has he made of them?

The tone of the *Merchant's Tale* is heavily satirical, and the purpose of the prefatory discussion of marriage is to establish the basis and the range of the attack in the story that follows. But notice, that if we presume a churchman telling the story of January and May, Chaucer has allowed him to comment cruelly on the realities of marriage and still stay within the church's position. Of course the sermon-like exposition of the benefits of marriage, especially if it is read within the sequence of the "marriage group," is filled with double intent. But we perceive an added element in Chaucer's dramatic skill here if we see how he has used the conventions of pulpit discourse to allow a cleric to enter the company's dispute on marriage and, at the same time, to attempt, superficially and mechanically, to preserve the "face" of the church position. This interpretation of the "defense" of marriage accounts also for placing January's anti-church views on "leveful procreation" early in the story. The preacher-narrator is filling in as much official morality as is necessary to justify his interest in the story. Chaucer, with great economy of means, has juxtaposed the church's theories to which this cleric can pay lip service against the tawdry example of a lecherous old January.

That the "defense" of marriage is conceived basically by Chaucer as a sermon is apparent, I believe. There are several appeals as to an audience:

And herke why, I sey nat this for noght,	1323
. . . and therefore bidde I thee,	1387

That every man that halt hym worth a leek,
 Upon his bare knees oughte al his lyf
 Thanken his God that hym hath sent a wyf,
 Or elles preye to God hym for to sende

1350-1353

The didacticism of a sermon structure is there. Like the Pardoner, this preacher has no theme, but only the related parts of a subject, *To take a wyf it is a glorious thing*. The divisions of his discourse may be set down as follows:

1. A wife is a glorious thing, for when a man is old,
 a wife will be his greatest treasure. 1268-1273
 - a. A bachelor lives an empty life 1274-1282
 - b. A married man's life is blissful and secure 1283-1292
 - c. Refutation of Theophrastus 1293-1310
2. A wife is a gift from God 1311
 - a. Not a transient gift of fortune 1312-1318
 - b. Marriage is a "ful greet sacrament" 1319-1322
 - c. This is proved by God's creation of Eve for Adam's help 1323-1332
 - d. Transition passage 1333-1337
3. A wife is man's proof against adversity 1338-1339
 - a. She is a bliss in herself 1340-1346
 - b. Transition passage 1347-1354
 - c. She counsels well against the world's
 deceits and her husband's mistakes 1355-1361
 - d. Witness four wives in the Bible 1362-1374
 - e. Witness the advice of two moral philosophers 1375-1379
 - f. A wife keeps her mate's "housbondrye" 1380-1382
4. An eloquent recapitulation 1383-1392

A comparison of structure, tone and the use of preacher's commonplaces here with the Pardoner's sermon will show many similarities. It has other points of comparison with the *Summoner's Tale*. All three "sermons" begin with a localized, slightly developed scene. This I take to be a narrative pattern of Chaucer's own choice, related perhaps to an exemplum-homiletic method, but one which would be difficult to distinguish from a natural story telling form. Like the Pardoner's usage, an apostrophe serves to move us from sermon division to another (1333-1337; 1347-1354). Like the Summoner's friar, this preacher defies his opponent (1310). Here, as in the Pardoner's sermon, the argument shifts back and forth from general terms and phrases to homely details and, using almost an identical

introductory phrase, the stories that the Pardoner and the "Merchant" tell are reintroduced as exempla:

These riotoures thre of whiche I telle
For which this Januarie, of whom I tolde

The three tales which I have examined appear to me to bear the proper sort of witness to Chaucer's awareness of pulpit rhetoric. He made use of conceptions of preaching which he knew his hearers (how well Chaucer's preacher-stories read aloud!) and his readers would recognize and enjoy, and this meant that the conventions must suit his dramatic and narrative purposes. He was completely at ease with his materials, for he concentrated, not on the rules of the preacher's craft, but on the preacher's intent and on how the congregation in a church or beside a roadside cross might receive the results. Of the *artes praedicandi* on display he selected the commonplace devices of preaching, the ordered didacticism of a general sermon shape, the *saffron* of *glosynge*, figures, examples and authorities. Most important for the living significance of his art, he knew how to set his materials to the tune of the man in the pulpit, to the coiling hypocrisies of the begging friar, to the heavy ironies of the cleric who first told the *Merchant's Tale*. But for the subtlest preacher,

That ravysshyn he shal yow with his speche

he saved the chords that ring like real conviction, and the impact of that sermon still amazes and confuses us.

Carleton College

CHARLES E. SHAIN

The Unity of Chaucer's Manciple Fragment

Scholars who have commented upon the *Canterbury Tales* generally seem to feel that whatever of Chaucer's literary artistry is present in Fragment IX—the Manciple's Prologue and Tale—is confined to the Prologue, with the Tale a piece of literary hack work arbitrarily appended thereto. Kittredge¹ and Coghill,² in their chapters on the

¹G. L. Kittredge, *Chaucer and his Poetry* (Cambridge, Mass., 1915).

²N. Coghill, *The Poet Chaucer* (Oxford, 1949).

relations between various tales and their tellers, completely ignore the Manciple's Prologue and Tale. Manly, tho stating that the Manciple's Prologue "is in Chaucer's best realistic manner,"³ considers the Manciple's Tale inappropriate to the teller.⁴ Robinson states that there is no indication in the Manciple's Tale that it was written for one of the Canterbury pilgrims⁵ and that "there is no close connection between the Manciple's Prologue and Tale, or indication that the latter was written with the particular situation in mind."⁶ In two of the latest studies on the *Canterbury Tales*, both Malone⁷ and Lawrence⁸ specifically indicate that there is no real connection between the Manciple's Prologue and Tale, and that the tale has not been particularly adapted to the teller—altho Lawrence makes the point that the Prologue is one of Chaucer's very best links, vivid and dramatic poetry. Thus, it has been general critical practice either to ignore the Manciple Fragment altogether or to praise the Prologue while cursorily dismissing the Tale and denying any connection between the two.⁹

However, I believe that a definite connection does exist between the Manciple's Prologue and Tale and that this connection is independent of whether or not the Manciple's Tale is explicitly expressive of the character of the Manciple, or elaborates the description of him given in the General Prologue, or is such a tale as might necessarily be expected from his personality and station in life. For these were not the only means used by Chaucer to achieve unity in the *Canterbury Tales*. Chaucer also would often make the individual tale fit its own prologue as closely as possible in a literary sense—the tale and its prologue both treating of the same topic¹⁰—as, e. g., the Mer-

³ Geoffrey Chaucer, *Canterbury Tales*, ed. J. M. Manly (New York, 1928), p. 654.

⁴ J. M. Manly, *Some New Light on Chaucer* (New York, 1926), pp. 257 f.

⁵ F. N. Robinson, ed., *Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* (Cambridge, Mass., 1933), p. 16. Line references to Chaucer's poetry are to this edition.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 870.

⁷ Kemp Malone, *Chapters on Chaucer* (Baltimore, 1951), p. 232.

⁸ W. W. Lawrence, *Chaucer and the Canterbury Tales* (New York, 1950), pp. 147 f.

⁹ J. B. Severs' article in *JEGP*, LI (1952), 1-17, is an exception to this general critical practice. Professor Severs thinks the Tale has definite literary artistry, that it is expressive of the Manciple's character as seen in the General Prologue and in the Manciple's Prologue, and that there do exist definite relationships between the Tale and its Prologue. His main concern, however, is with the Tale itself, and he does not particularly stress the detailed relationships between the Tale and its Prologue.

¹⁰ Cf. Malone, *op. cit.*, p. 217.

chant's Prologue and Tale or the Wife of Bath's Prologue and Tale.¹¹ He would also utilize the realism inherent in the conception of an actual pilgrimage, with tales deriving from the interplay of personalities on the journey, as, e.g., the Miller's and Reeve's Prologues and Tales. I shall demonstrate below how Chaucer, by the use of these devices, has fitted the Manciple's Tale to the Manciple's Prologue, giving an artistic unity to the whole Manciple Fragment.

In the Manciple's Prologue, in the speech in which the Host says he will excuse the Cook from telling his tale, the Host mentions as one of his reasons for so doing that the Cook is drunk and "lewedly wolde tell his tale."¹² The meaning of "lewedly" in this context is either "coarsely" or "rudely." In the Tale, the Manciple, telling how when Phebus was away his wife sent for her lemman, interrupts the tale to apologize for using such crude language:

His lemman? Certes, this is a knavyssh speche!
Foryeveth it me, and that I yow beseche.¹³

He follows this with a fairly lengthy passage making the point that words must accord with deeds. It appears here that the Manciple is reminding himself that the Host told him to tell a tale rather than the Cook because the Host felt that the Cook would have told his tale rudely or coarsely, so that Manciple here feels it incumbent upon himself to apologize for using such a rude word and interrupts his tale to excuse himself.

If such an interpretation of these lines appears far-fetched, let it be remembered that a great deal of Chaucer's dramatic art in presenting the Canterbury pilgrimage consists of just such personal references to events which have already occurred on the journey. There is, e.g., the Wife of Bath's quick revenge on the Friar at the very beginning of her tale, or the Host's abrupt cessation of his revelations about his wife, in the Epilogue to the Merchant's Tale, saying that he will relate no more for fear that it will be reported to her by

¹¹ Cf. M. Schlauch, *PMLA*, LXI (1946), 416-430. Professor Schlauch demonstrates that Chaucer, in substituting in the Wife of Bath's Tale the hero's choice of "foul and faithful, or fair and free" for the "fair by day and foul by night, or foul by day and fair by night" of the other analogues, bound the Tale more closely to the Prologue. For in the misogynistic literature which Chaucer used as a source for the Prologue, this was always one of the points made—that a woman would be unfaithful if she were fair, and faithful only if she were ugly.

¹² *Canterbury Tales*, IX, 59.

¹³ *Ibid.*, IX, 205 f.

some member of the company, who need not be named (which statement must have been accompanied by a glance at the Wife of Bath). And there are, of course, within the tales and links constituting the Marriage Group, the many references both direct and oblique to previous material in that Group. In addition to such personal references, Chaucer also achieves structural linking between various parts of the *Canterbury Tales* by using the same word, phrase or idea on two different occasions, achieving dramatic contrast by the contexts in which the same word, idea or phrase is used. E. g., in the Merchant's Tale, January says he will have a young wife because she can be handled as easily as warm wax; and in the denouement January is betrayed by means of a wax impression made of the lock to his private garden. In the Summoner's Tale, the friar warns Thomas not to distribute alms to all and sundry, for "what is a ferthyng worth parted in twelve?"¹⁴ and in the denouement he is shown how the gift he received from Thomas may be parted in twelve. Examples of these kinds of cross-references and linking occur thruout the *Canterbury Tales*, and often enough so that they cannot be dismissed as merely fortuitous. Therefore, when the same sort of linking occurs between the Manciple's Prologue and Tale—the Host's skipping the Cook's tale for fear that it would be told coarsely, and the Manciple, who tells a tale instead, interrupting his tale to apologize for his coarse language (which is not really very coarse)—it seems to me that this is a conscious device used by Chaucer to bind the Manciple's Tale closer to its Prologue.

Chaucer also used another means of linking the Manciple's Prologue to the Tale, a means which is recognized as one of Chaucer's definite stylistic devices—using a tale as an exemplum illustrating a point made in the tale's prologue. This is the case in the Wife of Bath's Prologue and Tale, the Pardoner's Prologue and Tale, and the Canon's Yeoman's Prologue and Tale;¹⁵ and this same sort of relationship occurs in the Manciple's Prologue and Tale. I think that if any general conclusion is to be drawn from the events in the Manciple's Prologue, it is that it is unwise to be too outspoken in castigating another's faults. Certainly this sentiment is voiced by the Host, who tells the Manciple that he is foolish to reprove the Cook of vice thus openly; and the Manciple

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, III, 1967.

¹⁵ Cf. B. J. Whiting, in *Sources and Analogues of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales*, ed. W. F. Bryan and Germaine Dempster (Chicago, 1941), p. 223.

admits the truth of the Host's argument by proceeding to make immediate amends to the Cook for his rough speech. Thus, in the Prologue the Manciple has been guilty of indiscreet speech and shows himself aware of the harm that can result therefrom. And in his Tale the Manciple tells a story showing the harm that may come from indiscreet speech, no matter how righteous it may be (just as the Manciple's denunciation of the Cook was righteous enough). And in the peroration which he appends to his Tale, the Manciple fervently warns all and sundry to be guarded in their speech. The same sequence of events—a discussion of a topic, a tale illustrating the teller's point of view on that topic, and an exhortation stressing the teller's point of view—may be seen in the Wife of Bath's, the Pardoner's, and the Canon's Yeoman's Prologues and Tales. This sequence is one of the features of Chaucer's literary art and cannot, therefore, be dismissed as fortuitous in the Manciple's Prologue and Tale.

Since the Manciple's Prologue and Tale are linked both by means of the dramatic action of the Canterbury pilgrimage and by the fact that the Tale illustrates a point made in the Prologue, then it seems to me that Fragment IX can no longer be considered a mediocre tale arbitrarily appended to a brilliant prologue, but rather a well-integrated whole, in which the material presented in the Prologue is further developed in the Tale.

Barnard College

MORTON DONNER

A Middle-English Poem on the Seven Gifts of the Holy Ghost

In his *Somme des Vices et Vertus*, Lorenz d'Orléans noted¹ that the medieval figura of the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost² as protection against sin, is derived from *Isaiah* xi: 2-3: *Et requiescet super*

¹See *The Book of Vices and Virtues* (EETS OS No. 217, p. 117), the editor of which, Professor W. Nelson Francis, notes at the start of his introduction that there were "at least nine English versions of this text between the *Ayenbite* of 1340 and the [Caxton's] *Royal Book* of c 1486."

²This figura was also associated with the celebration of Whitsunday (May 15), the day dedicated to the descent of the Holy Ghost on the Apostles (*Actus Sanctorum*, II. 4: *repleti sunt omnes Spiritu Sancto . . .*).

eum spiritus Domini: spiritus sapientiae et intellectus, / spiritus consilii et fortitudinis, / spiritus scientiae et pietatis; / et replebit eum spiritus timoris Domini. This figura was well known in fourteenth-century England: it is preserved in several versions such as the text in the *Mirror of St. Edmund* (see the ME translation printed in Horstman *Yorkshire Writers*, pp. 225, 246); the verse form printed by Patterson *ME Penetential Lyric*, No. 51 (also by Horstman in *EETS OS* No. 98, p. 34) from the Vernon MS; and the short form in prose in the Rolle texts (see *EETS OS* No. 20, p. 12; Horstman, *Yorkshire Writers*, pp. 45, 136, 196).

The present article offers a hitherto unprinted ME verse rendition of this figura which is preserved uniquely in fifteenth-century apograph fair copy in Cambridge University Library MS li. iv. 9, fol. 188^v-190^r (C. Brown & Rossell H. Robbins, *The Index of ME Verse*, No. 215). The content is close to, but not identical with, the tradition in Grosse-teste's *Castle of Love* (see the Sawley Monk's ME translation, in *EETS OS* No. 98, pp. 433-34). The transcription below silently expands unmistakable abbreviations and introduces editorial punctuation.

- | | | |
|---|------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1 | Hec sunt dona vij Sancta Spiritus. | (fol. 188 ^v) |
| | Alle þat well a stownde dwelle | |
| | Lysten I xal ȝou telle | |
| | Þe ȝeftes of þe Holygoste, | |
| 5 | Þat euer is of myghtes most. | |
| | Seuene ȝeftes ben þerinne | |
| | To saue man fro dedly synne. | |

Timor Domini (fol. 189^r)

- | | |
|----|------------------------------------|
| | The fyrst ȝefte, if ȝe take hede, |
| 10 | Certeynly it is drede. |
| | For to drede lowde or styлле |
| | For offendyn Goddes wyll. |
| | In hym we owyn han drede and loue— |
| | Almythty God þat syt aboue. |
| 15 | Qwhat man doth, I dare wel say, |
| | He plesyth God wyl to paye. |

Pietas Domini

- | | |
|----|-------------------------------------|
| | Pete is another ȝyfte |
| | Þat wyl þi sowle fro synne lyfte. |
| 20 | For to haue pety fare and ny |
| | To hem þat arn powre and nedy; |
| | Pou ȝeue hem good at nede |
| | And mekyl þe better xalt pou spede. |

- 25 Quat man þat be mercyable
Hys mercy xal neuer ben falle;
Quat man haue in herte ruthe
It is a synge of gret trewth.

Sciencia Dei

- 30 Kunnyng is a 3yfte good,
It amendyth many mannys mood.
Per may no maner crafte be doo
But if kunny[n]g go þerto.
Kunnyng is spred on many vyse
To sundry men ouer sundry gyse.
35 Bodyly, gostly, owth and in,
Kunny[n]g is non byrdeyn. (fol. 189^v)

Fortitudo Dei

- Myght is a ful gret thyng;
Ys iiij 3yfte of heuen kyng.
40 For to ben strong and hardy
Boþe bodely and gostly,
Holy werkys leuyng to wynne
And gostly to withstande synne.
Qwhoso vse streynkthe on þis vyse.
45 God is pleysed with hys servyse.

Consilium Dei

- Counsel is ful good of prys
Of man þat is wytty and wys.
If you haue a jurne for to don
50 Styrt noȝt þeron, ouer sone.
Take fyrst counsel or þou wende
Of hym þat is your best frende.
For wete it wel, boþe elde and zunge,
Vysement is good in al thyng.

55 Intellectus

- Vndyrstandyng is noȝt to woonde,
It comyth al of Goddes sonde
For to knowyn good & wykke
Gostly & bodyly, thynne [&] thykke.
60 To rewle þe in reson
In quat thyng þat þou xalt don.

Sapientia Dei

- Wyadam is þe seuende
3ouyn of Jhesu Cryste of heuen.
65 For to ben wys in al thyng
To kepe þe lawes of heuen kynge,
Þes are þe vij 3yftes most (fol. 190^r)

70 Pat comyn of þe Holygoste.
 Many moo are zeue withal
 But þes vij are principal.
 Þerfor boþe erly & late
 I rede we take hede þerate
 To receyuyne hem boþe day & nyth
 Þerto God grawnt grace and myth.

Explicunt septem dona Spiritus Sancti

University of Florida

R. H. BOWERS

Lydgate's "Halff Chongyd Latyne": an Illustration

In an article entitled "William Dunbar as a Scottish Lydgatian,"¹ P. H. Nichols revealed a close parallel between certain phrases and figurative expressions used by Dunbar in his poems in praise of the Virgin Mary² and similar expressions in two of Lydgate's poems.³ Nichols proves that Dunbar drew directly upon Lydgate's poems in this instance, but does not make the point that few, if any, of these phrases and figurative expressions were original to Lydgate. They were, in fact, drawn by Lydgate from the common stock of such expressions, and most of them derive ultimately from the liturgy and patristic commentary.⁴ It is of interest, too, to note that Dunbar, though in general he shared Lydgate's delight in aureate phrases, makes no use of certain rather curious expressions, such as "fructifying olyve," "benyngne braunchelet of the pigment tre," and "vinarye envermailyd," which occur at the beginning (stanzas 4-10) of Lydgate's *Ballade at the Reverence of Our Lady*. The immediate source of these terms,⁵ together with the familiar sequence ("sterne of the sea," "way of lyfe") with which they are mingled, would appear to be a passage of a dozen lines headed "Mariae Virginis

¹ *PMLA*, XLVI (1931), 214-224.

² *Poems of William Dunbar*, ed. J. Small (*STS*, 1889-1893), Vol. II, NO:S LXXXV and LXXXVI.

³ *The Minor Poems of John Lydgate*, Part I, ed. H. N. MacCracken (*EETS*, 1911), NO:S 49 and 63.

⁴ See J. P. Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, CCXIX, 504, "Index Marianus" *passim*.

⁵ They derive ultimately from the liturgy and from *Ecclesiasticus*, XXIV, 13-17.

laudes et praerogativa" from the *Anticlaudianus* of Alanus de Insulis,⁶ for there is a remarkable correspondence between the terms which are used in these passages:

Anticlaudianus

stella maris
vitae via
porta salutis
origo virtutis
veniae mater
thalamusque pudoris
hortus conclusus
fons consignatus
oliva fructificans
cedrus redolens
paradisus amoenans
virgula pigmenti
vinaria cella
liquore praedita caelesti
nectar caeleste propinans
nescia spineti florens rosa
fons expers limi

lux nubila pellens
spes miseris
medicina reis
proscriptis reditus
erranti semita
dejectis requies
pausatio fessis

Ballade at the Reverence of Our Lady

sterne of the see
way of lyfe
haven after tempest
original gynnyng of grace and al goodnesse
modyr of mercy
chambyr and closet clennest of chastyte
closid gardeyn
cristallyn well of clennese cler consigned
fructifying olyve
redolent cedyr
paradys of plesaunce
benynge braunchelet of the pigment tre
vinarye envermailyd
lycour azens all langour
refrescher of our food
redy rose, flouryng with-outyn spyne
founteyn of fulnesse, as beryl corrent clere
clennest condite of vertu
þu lyght withoutyn nebule
medicine to myscheuous
retour of exilid put in proscrypeyoun
to hem þat erryn, the path of her sequele
to veri wandrid, the tente paviloun
þe feynt to fresshe, and þe pawsacion

This close correspondence between Lydgate's stanzas and the lines from the *Anticlaudianus* is a most interesting illustration of the way in which some of the aureate terms came to be formed. We could not wish for a clearer example of the "halff chongyd Latyne" which John Metham attributes to Lydgate:

Eke Ion Lydgate, sumtyme monke off Byry,
Hys bokys endyted with termys off retoryk
And halff chongyd Latyne, with conseytys off poetry
And crafty imagynacionys off thingys fantasyk;
But eke hys qwyght her schewyd, and hys late werk,
How that hys contynwauns made hym both a poyet and a clerk.⁷

⁶ Migne, *PL*, ccx, 538.

⁷ *The Works of John Metham*, ed. Hardin Craig (*EETS*, 1916), p. 80, stanza 317.

It will be noticed that Lydgate's handling of the terms which he borrowed varies from something closely related to the "simple bodily transfer of . . . words," described by J. C. Mendenhall⁸ as a rare occurrence in the fifteenth century (for example, "fructifying olyve," "redolent cedyr"), to the freer and delightful rendering of such phrases as "dejectis requies" as "to weri wandrid, the tente paviloun." Perhaps the least successful of these aureate terms are "cristallyn welle of clenness e'er consigned" and "benynge braunchelet of the pigment tre" because they not only sound clumsy, but are, in addition, almost incomprehensible without reference to the original passage.

Royal Holloway College,
University of London

ISABEL HYDE

Sidney's Classical Meters

The pseudo-quantitative English verses which enjoyed a brief fad in Elizabethan literary circles are generally an unlovely lot, and the late Professor Theodore Spencer was right to observe the relative merit among them of one of Sidney's efforts, a poem beginning, "When to my deadlie pleasure," which appears among the "Certaine Sonets" of the 1598 folio.¹ Spencer, however, unaccountably mistook its form; he analyzes it according to the pseudo-Anacreontic pattern ~ ~ ~ ~ ~, remarking that "Sidney himself calls [this poem] 'Anacreon's kind of verses.'"² Sidney's identification, with notation of the pattern, is attached not to the poem which Spencer discusses but to one beginning, "My Muse, what ailes this Ardoure?" which appears in the *Old Arcadia*.³ "When to my deadlie pleasure," on

⁸ *Aureate Terms: A Study in the Literary Diction of the Fifteenth Century* (Lancaster, Pa., 1919), p. 61.

¹ *The Complete Works of Sir Philip Sidney*, ed. Albert Feuillerat (Cambridge, 1922-26), II, 316-17; Theodore Spencer, "The Poetry of Sir Philip Sidney," *ELH*, XII (1945), 251-78.

² Spencer, *loc. cit.*, pp. 260-61.

³ *Works*, IV, 154-56; Feuillerat also prints this poem, without its identifying context, among the "Poems First Printed in the Folio of 1593," II, 234-35. Enid Hamer has a portion of the correct poem with her definition of the Anacreontic (which Spencer quotes), but does not include "When to my deadlie pleasure" among Sidney's pseudo-quantitative poems (*The Metres of English Poetry* [New York, 1930], p. 302).

the other hand, is not given a metrical annotation by Sidney; and it is written in the pattern $\text{—} \sim \sim \text{—} \sim \text{—}$, which is that of the Aristophanic line. Thus, Spencer's dissatisfaction with some of the final spondees in the poem may be explained by the fact that they are intended to be trochees. The Aristophanic line occurs as the first verse of the "lesser" Sapphic strophe, a distich used by Horace in *Odes*, I, 8.

In addition to being a kind of primrose among thorns, then, this poem is also one of the most esoteric of the experiments in classical meters. It may be observed generally that Sidney's poems of this sort exhibit considerably greater variety of experimentation than those of his contemporary "versifiers," who usually aimed at epic hexameters. Indeed, Sidney has only two poems, though relatively long ones, in the epic line: "Lady reserved by the heavens" (*Works*, II, 208-14 and IV, 77-86) and "Faire rocks, goodly rivers" (I, 352-53 and IV, 152-54). The others are written in lyric meters from Horace and Catullus. "Unto no body my woman saith" (II, 307) translates and imitates the elegiac distichs of Catullus, No. 70; its companion epigram, "Faire seeke not to be feard" is also in elegiacs, as are "Fortune, Nature, Love" (II, 208 and IV, 75-76) and "Unto a caitife wretch" (I, 357-59 and IV, 318-20). "If mine eyes can speake" (I, 143-44 and IV, 76-77) and "O my thoughtes" (IV, 401) are written in the greater Sapphic strophe.⁴ The Phalacean hendecasyllable, which Sidney uses for "Reason tell me thy mind" (II, 236 and IV, 156-57), is a favorite line of Catullus (No. 42, for example); and Horace uses three times⁵ the Asclepiadean line that Sidney adopts for "O sweete woodes" (II, 237-38 and IV, 157-58).

In the copy of the Old *Arcadia* that Feuillerat prints (vol. iv) the pseudo-quantitative poems are announced by name and by a notation of the meter; these identifications are all accurate, though the pattern notations for the elegiacs and the hexameters give no indication of variations which were allowable in classical practice and which Sidney in fact did admit into his.

University of Rochester

JAMES APPLGATE

⁴ Elegiac and Sapphic meters are of course common in both Catullus and Horace; the latter's *Rectius vives* (*Odes*, II, 10), for example, is written in Sapphics, though Sidney translates it into terza rima (*Works*, II, 307).

⁵ *Odes*, I, 1; III, 30; and IV, 8.

Thomson's "Ode on the Winter Solstice"

Some time ago I acquired from Messrs. Maggs Brothers of London the manuscript of an unpublished poem by James Thomson, author of *The Seasons*. It is written in Thomson's distinctive hand on two sides of a quarto page, and is endorsed by Lord Lyttelton, "By Thompson [*sic*] and in his own handwriting." In transcribing I have modernized the spelling, punctuation, and capitalization.

AN ODE ON THE WINTER SOLSTICE

1

Why, gentle Aura, dost thou thus complain,
And touch my trembling * harp with such soft woe?
Is it because, far o'er the southern main,
Thy lover Phoebus hangs so pale and low?

2

I would not cheer thee, for thy plaints delight,
They suit the pensive temper of my soul;
But now he gains some minutes from the Night,
And rolls his Empire on our other Pole.

3

He turns! He turns! How lovely beams his face
The skies grow clearer, and the fields more gay.
What do I see? The Spring, with tender grace,
Comes brightening on: Sweet Season! come away!

4

I who have sung thee, thy blest poet I,
Hail thy approach, invite thee to my bowers:
Come, from the green Hesperian Islands fly,
Awake my songsters, and expand my flowers!

5

Not many visits more my downward age
Can from thee hope: then be they kinder still!
O then, of flashing Eurus chain the rage,
And all my powers with vernal pleasure fill!

6

Yet, Aura, when thy lover shall return,
And shoot himself into thy soul again,
Yet sometimes languish while with joy you burn:
Lovers, though happy, ever will complain.

* Aeolus's harp. [Thomson's note.]

When Thomson wrote this poem, and why it happened to remain unpublished,¹ are questions one would like to have answered. It is clear from stanza 4 that it must have been written not earlier than 1728 (the year *Spring* was published). If the remarks about his age are not a poetic fiction, the poem may be from the late 1740's, in which case two possible reasons for its not being published suggest themselves: (1) he had seen Akenside's newly published² poem on the same topic, recognized the inferiority of his own production, and held it back, or (2) he may have written it so late in life that he never had an opportunity to publish it. The manuscript passed through Lyttelton's hands at some time; did his failure to include it in the edition of 1750 which he edited constitute another one of his editorial judgments upon Thomson's works,³ or did the manuscript come to him too late?

Trinity College
Hartford, Connecticut

RALPH M. WILLIAMS

Fielding and Dr. Samuel Clarke

The scholarship of recent years has made it unnecessary, among serious students at least, to deny Fielding's deism on the one hand or to reaffirm the seriousness of his Christian beliefs on the other. Indeed, on reading through his journals and novels, one finds it hard to understand how any question of Fielding's essential (even orthodox) Christianity could have arisen in the first place. His religious and ethical views can now be placed with some exactness amidst the general configuration of Latitudinarian Anglican thought during the early eighteenth century.¹ The present note is intended

¹ It may still, of course, turn up in some periodical or miscellany not available to me; but considering the amount of research done on Thomson in recent years, this seems unlikely.

² Although Akenside's "Ode on the Winter-Solstice" is said to have been printed in 1740, it was first published where Thomson would be likely to see it in Akenside's *Odes on Several Subjects* (London, 1745), pp. 9-14.

³ Cf. Douglas Grant, *James Thomson, Poet of "The Seasons"* (London, 1951), pp. 276-7.

¹ See especially James A. Work, "Henry Fielding, Christian Censor," in *The Age of Johnson: Essays Presented to Chauncey Brewster Tinker* (New Haven, 1949), pp. 139-149. The influence of the Latitudinarian divines on the sentimentalist morality of the period has been demonstrated by R. S.

to substantiate this comparatively recent view of Fielding by indicating how closely the novelist followed one of his favorite Latitudinarian divines, Dr. Samuel Clarke,² in dealing with a central religious issue in *Amelia*.

As Professor Sherburn has ably suggested, the psychological and moral interest of *Amelia* centers about the rescue of Amelia's husband, William Booth,—a fundamentally good man—from his "very slight and uncertain" notions of religion and moral virtue.³ It is during the opening prison scenes of *Amelia* that Booth's state of mind is revealed through his conversations with fellow inmates, notably the gambler, Mr. Robinson, and the demi-mondaine, Miss Matthews. And it is in the account of the former's "deism" that we may observe the close similarity, if not indebtedness, of Fielding's descriptive terminology to that of Dr. Clarke.

Mr. Robinson, a person of highly disreputable appearance, encounters Booth in the prison yard and at once begins a "philosophical" conversation:

"I perceive, sir, you are but just arrived in this dismal place, which is indeed rendered more detestable by the wretches who inhabit it than by any other circumstance; but even these a wise man will soon bring himself to bear with indifference; for what is, is; and what must be, must be. The knowledge of this, which, simple as it appears, is in truth the height of all philosophy, renders a wise man superior to every evil which can befall him. I hope, sir, no very dreadful accident is the cause of your coming hither; but whatever it was, you may be assured it could not be otherwise; for all things happen by an inevitable fatality; and a man can no more resist the impulse of fate than a wheelbarrow can the force of its driver."

Fielding then goes on to describe Robinson as "what they call a freethinker—that is to say, a deist, or, perhaps, an atheist; for

Crane in "Suggestions toward a Genealogy of the 'Man of Feeling'", *ELH*, I (1934), 205-230.

² The career of Dr. Samuel Clarke (1675-1729) is too well known to require elaboration here. He was, among other things, Boyle Lecturer 1704-5; Rector of St. James's, Westminster; an intimate of Queen Caroline's; the translator of Newton's *Optics*; a famous Latitudinarian theologian and controversialist (with Leibnitz); the associate of Whiston and Hoadley. His most important works were his Boyle lectures and *The Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity* (1712); the latter brought against him the charge of Arianism. For a recent study of Clarke's religious thought, see Roland N. Stromberg, *Religious Liberalism in Eighteenth-Century England* (Oxford, 1954), pp. 38-48, 55-57. Fielding refers to Clarke in the company of Archbishop Tillotson and Dr. Robert South in the *Champion*, January 22, 1739/40, and in the company of Dr. Isaac Barrow and Tillotson in the *Covent-Garden Journal*, January 14, 1752.

³ "Fielding's *Amelia*: An Interpretation," *ELH*, III (1936), 1-14.

though he did not absolutely deny the existence of a God, yet he entirely denied his providence." He adds significantly, "A doctrine which, if it is not downright atheism, hath a direct tendency toward it; and, as Dr. Clarke observes, may soon be driven into it."⁴

It will be noted that Fielding's terminology is, like that of his contemporaries, extremely vague; Mr. Robinson is called a free-thinker, a deist, or perhaps an atheist. Furthermore, from the account of Robinson's resignation to the principle, "what must be, must be," one might wonder why Fielding did not add the term "Stoic" as well. It is, however, possible, by taking the hints contained in the mention of his belief in fate, his denial of Providence, and in the reference to Dr. Clarke, to categorize Mr. Robinson's position with some precision.

Samuel Clarke, in the Boyle Lectures for 1704, attacked the materialism or "atheism" of Hobbes and Spinoza from various standpoints. He particularly defended the freedom of the human will against the presumed necessitarian views of their philosophies. These he summed up as follows:

1st. That, since every Effect must needs be produced by some Cause; therefore, as every Motion in a Body must have been caused by the Impulse of some other Body; and the Motion of That by the Impulse of a Third; so every Volition, or Determination of the Will of Man, must needs be produced by some External Cause, and That in like Manner be the Effect of some Third. And consequently, that there cannot possibly be any such Thing in Nature, as Liberty or Freedom of Will.

2dly. That Thinking, and all its Modes, as Willing and the like, are Qualities or Affections of Matter. And consequently, since 'tis manifest that Matter has not in it self a Power of Beginning Motion, or giving it self any Manner of Determination whatsoever; therefore 'tis evident likewise, that 'tis impossible there should be any such thing as Freedom of Will.⁵

It seems clear that Robinson, with his belief that men were under an irresistible fatality, is one of the Hobbesian determinists whom Clarke was attacking. But he also belongs to the first of the four general types of deists whom Clarke analyzed in the Boyle Lectures for the following year (1705). Here the verbal parallels between Clarke and Fielding are striking:

I. Some Men would be thought to be *Deists*, because they pretend to believe in the Existence of a Eternal, Infinite, Independent, Intelligent Being;

⁴ Bk. I, ch. 3.

⁵ *A Demonstration of the Being and Attributes of God* (6th ed.; London, 1725), pp. 81-2.

and to avoid the name of Epicurean Atheists, teach also that this Supreme Being made the World: Though at the same time they agree with the Epicureans in this, that they fancy God does *not at all* concern himself in the Government of the World, nor has any regard to, or care of, what is done therein. But, if we examine things duly, this Opinion must unavoidably terminate in *absolute Atheism*.

He adds:

. . . yet to fancy that God originally created a certain Quantity of Matter and Motion, and left them to frame a World at adventures, without any determinate and particular view, design, or direction; this can in no way be defended consistently, but must of necessity recur to *downright Atheism*.⁶

These are the lines which must be in the background of Fielding's description of Robinson as "a deist, or, perhaps an atheist" since he adhered to a doctrine "which, if it is not downright atheism, hath a direct tendency toward it; and . . . may soon be driven into it."

Fielding carefully establishes Robinson, the materialistic determinist, as a foil to Booth, who might be called a psychological determinist because of his belief in the dominance of ruling passions.⁷ Booth agrees with Robinson on the principles of necessity, "adding, however, that he did not believe men were under any blind impulse or direction of fate, but that every man acted merely from the force of that passion which was uppermost in his mind, and could do no otherwise."⁸ The Hobbesian Robinson is little better than an atheist; the semi-Mandevillian Booth,⁹ while sadly in error, has, as befits the novel's hero, many redeeming features in his heterodoxy.

Queens College

A. R. TOWERS

⁶ *A Discourse Concerning the Unchangeable Obligations of Natural Religion, and the Truth and Certainty of the Christian Revelation* (6th ed.; London, 1724), pp. 12-13.

⁷ Cf. Sherburn, *op. cit.*, pp. 4-6.

⁸ Bk. III, ch. 3.

⁹ Booth's view of the passions is remarkably close to that expressed by Mandeville in the introduction to *An Enquiry into the Origin of Moral Virtue*: "As for my Part, without any Compliment to the Courteous Reader, or my self, I believe Man . . . to be a compound of various Passions that all of them, as they are provoked and come uppermost, govern him by turns, whether he will or no" (*The Fable of the Bees; or, Private Vices, Publick Benefits*, ed. F. B. Kaye [Oxford, 1924], Vol. I, p. 39). Fielding, however, is careful not to put his hero in too bad a light: when Miss Matthews associates Booth's doctrine of the passions with that of "that charming fellow Mandeville," Booth strongly rejects the implication, stating that Mandeville, by reducing the passion of love to "the base impulses of pride and fear," had "represented human nature in a picture of the highest deformity" (Bk. III, ch. 5).

Southey and the *Quarterly Review*

The thirty-seventh number of the *Quarterly Review* contains an article, "On the Means of Improving the People," the authorship of which has for some time been in dispute. The purpose of this note is to show that the article was actually written by Robert Southey, to whom it was formerly ascribed, and not—as has since been claimed—by his friend John Rickman.¹

In almost all of his writings on political questions—and particularly those relating to the poor laws—Southey had the advice of Rickman, whose official duties gave him access to a great deal of information that was not generally available. The correspondence of the two men, which was reviewed by Mr. Orlo Williams, Rickman's biographer, contains many references to such information, and on the basis of this correspondence, Mr. Williams sought to show that the article in question, though "nominally" by Southey, was largely the work of Rickman.²

From his letters of early 1817, it is clear that Southey expected soon to write an article on the poor laws, a subject that he had often touched on in the *Quarterly*. Beginning in March, 1817, Rickman's references to the subject became fairly numerous, but, according to Mr. Williams,³ "it was not till late in October [1817] that Rickman got to work on his poor-law reflections for Southey." In a letter of October 29, 1817,⁴ he gave the broad outlines for an article upon the gradual diminution of the poor rates, and this sketch, as one finds by a careful comparison with the leading article in the *Quarterly Review*, No. 36, "On the Poor Laws," formed the back-

¹The available evidence for these attributions is cited in Hill Shine and Helen Chadwick Shine, *The Quarterly Review Under Gifford: Identification of Contributors, 1809-1824* (Chapel Hill, 1949), p. 61. To this article Mr. and Mrs. Shine assign the serial number 469, and by their indexing they indicate virtual acceptance of the interpretation made by Mr. Orlo Williams (see note 2 below). This interpretation is also followed by Jack Simmons, *Southey* (London, 1945), p. 242, note 219, and by Cabell Flanagan, "Robert Southey on Thomas Adams," *N&Q*, cxcvii (December 20, 1952), 554-555.

²Orlo Williams, *Lamb's Friend the Census-Taker: Life and Letters of John Rickman* (London, 1912), pp. 10, 134, 195-204. Many of Southey's letters to Rickman had already been published, some appearing in *The Life and Correspondence of Robert Southey*, ed. C. C. Southey (6 vols.; London, 1849-1850), *passim*, and others in *Selections from the Letters of Robert Southey*, ed. J. W. Warter (4 vols.; London, 1856), *passim*.

³*Op. cit.*, p. 195.

⁴*Ibid.*, pp. 196-197.

bone of that article.⁵ In commenting on this letter, however, Mr. Williams states that

the material which he [Rickman] sent to Southey was so good, as the letters plainly show, that his [i.e., Rickman's] paper was almost untouched and sent to the *Quarterly*, where it appeared in the number for April 1818 [i.e., No. 37] under the title 'The means of improving the People.' 'Your labours have given me a sort of holiday,' wrote Southey, who held over the material which he himself had prepared till the autumn number.⁶

Mr. Williams has here been misled by the dating of the various issues of the *Review* during this period. Issue No. 36, containing the article "On the Poor Laws," bears the date January, 1818, but it did not appear until May or June of that year.⁷ Issue No. 37, containing the article "On the Means of Improving the People," is dated April, 1818, but it was not published until September.⁸ Thus, with reference to the time of its actual appearance, rather than of its scheduled appearance, No. 37 must be considered the "autumn number."

A careful reading of the articles in question, together with Southey's letter to Rickman of April 22, 1818, and Rickman's letter to Southey of April 26, 1818, both of which Mr. Williams quotes,⁹ shows that "the fling at Malthus," which the poet's close friend Grosvenor Bedford "swore specially to as [Southey's] handmark," and the remarks "as to the city of Ely," in every phrase of which he professed to recognize Southey's manner of writing, occur not in the article "On the Means of Improving the People" (No. 37), but in that "On the Poor Laws" (No. 36).

Further evidence in proof of this reversal of attributions is offered by a letter from Southey to Rickman on October 5, 1818:

I have two papers in [the most recent issue of] the *Quarterly Review*,—'Evelyn's Memoirs,' and the other which you recognized, and which is the worse for not having been planned. I wrote the greater part thinking that your communications might be inserted, and hence there is a want of method about it. . . .¹⁰

⁵ Shine, *op. cit.*, p. 59, # 454.

⁶ Williams, *op. cit.*, p. 197.

⁷ Shine, *op. cit.*, p. 59, cites Murray's Register as evidence of the June date. But see *The Letters of Sir Walter Scott*, ed. H. J. C. Grierson, et al. (London, 1932-1937), v, 108, note.

⁸ Shine, *op. cit.*, p. 60. See also Scott, *Letters*, v, 169, note.

⁹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 203-204.

¹⁰ *Selections from the Letters of Robert Southey*, ed. J. W. Warter (London, 1856), III, 100. Italics mine.

The article of "Evelyn's Memoirs" appeared in No. 37;¹¹ hence the article which Rickman "recognized" must be "On the Means of Improving the People," the only other article in this issue with which Southey's name has any connection. If that article had, moreover, been wholly or largely Rickman's work, Southey assuredly would not have made the somewhat depreciatory remarks contained in this letter to that same friend.

University of Texas

NAT LEWIS KADERLY

Adam Bede: Arthur Donnithorne and Zeluco

The seduction of Hetty in *Adam Bede* is indicated only in a shadowy and allusive way; but early in the book there is a revealing symbolic foreshadowing of its meaning for Arthur. Made restless by his attraction to Hetty, Arthur decided to see her and to get the matter out of his mind. He went towards the Hermitage to pass the afternoon finishing Dr. Moore's *Zeluco*, a novel popular at this time, 1799. As he strolled carelessly along with the book under his arm, he met Hetty, talked gently to her, and finally kissed her. After they parted, Arthur became troubled: he hurried to the Hermitage, "unlocked the door with a hasty wrench, slammed it after him, pitched *Zeluco* into the most distant corner. . . . He was getting in love with Hetty. . . . He was ready to pitch everything else—no matter where—for the sake of . . . this delicious feeling."¹ His conscience uneasy, he determines not to see her, but his infirmity of purpose will lead to seduction, ruin, and murder.

What is significant here is the reference to *Zeluco*. George Eliot uses books to indicate interests, social status, or date (as the mention of the *Lyrical Ballads* helps set the time of *Adam Bede*), but the reference to *Zeluco* is symbolic.² For its hero is an arch-seducer, and the novel is the story of his downfall. Like Arthur Donnithorne,

¹¹ Shine, *op. cit.*, p. 60, #467.

¹ George Eliot, *Adam Bede, The Writings of George Eliot*, Warwickshire Edition, III and IV (Boston, 1909), I, 189.

² Compare the obviously symbolic references to *The Pirate* in Bk. V, Ch. i, and to *The Pirate, Ivanhoe*, and *Corinne* in Bk. V, Ch. iv, of *The Mill on the Floss*.

this rich and well-favored young man has "every advantage of person, birth, and fortune."³ Both lack the restraining influence of a father; both are connected with the Army. Arthur is vain and patronizing; Zeluco is insolent and domineering; both are susceptible to the corruption of power. Although Zeluco becomes more depraved than Arthur, he has started from the same point. Not naturally cruel and unfeeling, Zeluco is led to be so by his selfishness and vanity. As a child he had crushed a pet sparrow in a burst of passion. Grown up to be a thoroughgoing scoundrel, he seduces, neglects, and duels over his first victim on the tenth page of the novel, and he pursues a career of cruelty, vanity, and lust to a terrible end. After he has strangled his infant, Zeluco reflects "that the child's death was occasioned by the propensity he [himself] betrayed in his infancy, and had indulged ever since, of giving way to every impulse of passion" (*Zeluco*, II, 191). Arthur would have been horrified at this fearful example in the novel, but in his own life he is beginning an affair with Hetty which will lead to the same end, the murder of his child.

Without the makings of a scoundrel, Arthur does in fact cause as much external evil and moral destruction to others as the melodramatic villain of *Zeluco*. Arthur is not vicious—he is weak; weakness allows him to give way briefly to selfish passion. As a child he had kicked over an old gardener's pitcher of broth merely from an impulse to kick. For him, however, vice is checked by his habit of living in the opinion of others, of being dependent on their approval of his conduct. But, and this is the point of the reference to *Zeluco*, Arthur, desiring Hetty yet careless of her and of the consequences of his act, is in a position to choose a course that might lead him to the same kind of moral degradation that undid Zeluco. "Whether he would have self-mastery enough to be always as harmless and purely beneficent as his good-nature led him to desire, was a question that no one had yet decided against him" (*Adam Bede*, I, 177). Certainly when he enters the Hermitage (and the irony in the name seems intentional), he has before him a lurid example of what giving way to passion can do.

In writing *Zeluco*, Moore, a keen psychologist and acute observer of manners, had something of the same kind of intention as George Eliot. "Religion teaches," says Dr. Moore in the first chapter of

³ Dr. John Moore, *Zeluco*, in *The British Novelists*, ed. Mrs. Barbauld, New Edition (London, 1820), II, 257.

Zeluco, "that vice leads to endless misery in a future state; and experience proves that . . . even in this life her ways are ways of wretchedness, and all her paths are woe . . . yet the conduct of men would sometimes lead us to suspect, that either they had never heard [this truth] . . . , or that they think it false. To recal [*sic*] a truth of such importance to the recollection of mankind, and to illustrate it by example, may therefore be of use" (*Zeluco*, I, 1).

Such good advice Arthur ought to have read more carefully. Just how explicitly George Eliot had all this in mind when she put *Zeluco* into Arthur's hands we cannot say. Perhaps she was giving the reader a hint of what was to happen—a hint more likely to be meaningful in her time than ours. Certainly the reference to *Zeluco* is a symbolic prophecy about Arthur's conduct. And in making Arthur pitch *Zeluco* into a corner (as he is willing to pitch everything away for Hetty) George Eliot indicated that Arthur was rejecting the sound morality of Dr. Moore, ignoring the warning of *Zeluco*, and earning the title Adam was to give him, "a selfish, light-minded scoundrel" (*Adam Bede*, II, 5). Perhaps, even, she meant the book, with its accounts of *Zeluco*'s seductions, to put ideas into Arthur's head.

University of Notre Dame

JEROME THALE

Source of the Word "Agnostic"

The etymological note concerning the word "agnostic" in the OED was recorded in a letter dated March 13, 1881, by R. H. Hutton, who says that the term was "suggested by Huxley at a party held previous to the formation of the now defunct Metaphysical Society, at Mr. James Knowles's house on Clapham Common, one evening in 1869, in my hearing. He took it from St. Paul's mention of the altar 'to the Unknown God.'" This account conflicts with a version given by Huxley in 1889. A "man without a rag of a label to cover himself with" in the Metaphysical Society composed of "-ists of one sort or another," Huxley says that he took thought and "invented what I conceived to be the appropriate title of 'agnostic.' It came into my head as suggestively antithetic to the 'gnostic' of Church

history, who professed to know so much about the very things of which I was ignorant; and I took the earliest opportunity of parading it at our Society."¹ Apparently Hutton's account was accepted as authentic until 1947, when C. T. Onions raised an objection to it.

A letter addressed to the editor of *TLS* in May of 1947 presents a strong argument by Onions, in which he attempts to prove that Huxley's invention carried no reference to the ἀγνώστος of Acts, xxiii.17, since "to connect *agnostic* with the Ἀγνώστῳ Θεῷ (to an Unknown God) . . . does not make etymological sense"; and he quotes Huxley's account to strengthen his point.² There is evidence, however, which suggests that Huxley did have in mind the Athenian altar Ἀγνώστῳ Θεῷ when he coined the word, and that Hutton was not entirely misrepresenting Huxley's agnosticism by describing it as "belief in an unknown and unknowable God."

It is interesting to note first that neither account gives a very exact date for the invention.³ Moreover, Hutton states clearly that the invention occurred before the formation of the Metaphysical Society, but Huxley implies that the Society was already formed when he introduced the new term.

Now Huxley explicitly denied that the inscription on the Athenian altar should be interpreted to include an unknowable God. Evidence of this is found in the last essay he wrote, entitled "Mr. Balfour's Attack on Agnosticism" (*Nineteenth Century*, xxxvii, 1895, 527-540). At one point (p. 535), he examines a sentence from Hamilton's *Discussions*. The sentence reads: "But the last and highest consecration of all true religion must be an altar—Ἀγνώστῳ Θεῷ—'To the Unknown and Unknowable God.'" Huxley considers the words "and Unknowable God" to be an interpolation. He says (p. 536):

For ἀγνώστος, so far as I can ascertain, always means 'unknown' (whether from ignorance or forgetfulness) and implies nothing about the possibility of being known. . . . Moreover, as the Athenians used the word in the inscription which the Apostle read, they certainly did not mean to honour an 'unknowable' Deity, but simply any divine personage who by mischance had been overlooked."⁴

¹ *Science and Christian Tradition* (New York, 1909), p. 239.

² "Agnostic," *TLS*, XLVII, 225. See also p. 451.

³ A more precise date is given by J. R. Thorne, who, in 1882, quoted Sir James Murray as saying: "I now have plenty of instances for *agnosticism*, which was invented by Prof. Huxley in September, 1869, as I discovered after a considerable chase." See *Notes and Queries*, 6th Series, VI (1882), 418.

⁴ Cf. Onions, "Agnostic," p. 225. "It is true that ἀγνώστος may mean (1)

With respect to the essential point in agnosticism, Huxley made his position clear in an article for the *Nineteenth Century* of June, 1889. Declaring that agnosticism is a creed only when it "expresses absolute faith in the validity of a principle," he wrote:

This principle may be stated in various ways, but they all amount to this: that it is wrong for a man to say that he is certain of the objective truth of any proposition unless he can produce evidence which logically justifies that certainty [and] that the application of this principle results in the denial of, or the suspension of judgment concerning, a number of propositions respecting which our contemporary ecclesiastical 'gnostics' profess entire certainty.⁵

A few lines later appears this sentence: "I do not very much care to speak of anything as 'unknowable,'" and commenting upon this Huxley adds:

there are many topics about which I know nothing; and which, so far as I can see, are out of reach of my faculties. But whether these things are knowable by anyone else is exactly one of those matters which is beyond my knowledge, though I may have a tolerably strong opinion as to the probabilities of the case.

Again, in a letter to F. C. Gould in 1889, he said:

Whether the Unknowable or any other Noumenon exists or does not exist, I am quite clear I have no knowledge either way. So with respect to whether there is anything behind Force or not, I am ignorant; I neither affirm nor deny. The tendency of the human mind to idolatry is so strong that, *faute de mieux*, it falls down and worships negative abstractions. . . . The one object of the Agnostic (in the true sense) is to knock this tendency on the head whenever or wherever it shows itself.⁶

But we have been listening to Huxley speak late in his life. In 1866 he wrote an essay, entitled "On the Advisableness of Improving Natural Knowledge," in which he made a reference to the Athenian altar that included both an unknown and an unknowable God. The essay was first printed in the *Fortnightly Review* of January, 1866 (III, 626-637). Here (p. 636) there is a passage that reads:

if the religion of the present differs from that of the past, it is because the theology of the present has become more scientific than that of the past; because it has not only renounced idols of wood and idols of stone, but begins

unknown, (2) unknowable, (3) unknowing, but it is only the third meaning that can be directly connected with that of the word *agnostic*."

⁵ "Agnosticism and Christianity," *Nineteenth Century*, xxv, 937-938.

⁶ Edward Clodd, *Thomas Henry Huxley* (London, 1905), p. 220.

to see the necessity of breaking in pieces the idols built up of books and traditions and fine-spun ecclesiastical cobwebs; and of cherishing the noblest and most human of man's emotions, by worship 'for the most part of the silent sort' at the altar of the Unknown and Unknowable.

Four years later the essay appeared in *Lay Sermons, Addresses, and Reviews*, which went through several editions and reprints. In this volume (New York: D. Appleton Co., 1871, p. 16) the passage has not been altered. But upon examination of the essay in *Method and Results*⁷ (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1911, p. 38), we find that the passage ends: "by worship 'for the most part of the silent sort' at the altar of the Unknown."

Therefore, sometime between 1871 and 1893 Huxley struck out the words "and Unknowable" from the essay. But in the Preface to *Method and Results*, he says: "these essays are free neither from superfluities in the way of repetition, nor from deficiencies. . . . But so far as their substance goes, I find nothing to alter in them,—though the oldest bears the date of 1866."

Huxley acknowledged the alteration about a year later. In December of 1893 he revised the essay "Agnosticism and Christianity" for inclusion in the fifth volume of his *Collected Essays*.⁸ It was noted above that this essay contains the statement "I do not very much care to speak of anything as 'unknowable.'" When this statement appeared in the *Collected Essays*, it carried a reference to a footnote. The footnote reads: "I confess that, long ago, I once or twice made this mistake; even to the waste of a capital 'U.' 1893."⁹ The footnote did not appear in the essay when printed in the *Nineteenth Century* of June, 1889.¹⁰

The second instance of a reference to something as unknowable occurs again in the essay "On the Advisableness of Improving Natural Knowledge," and this one Huxley failed to change. There is a sentence that runs: "the little light of awakened human intelligence shines so mere a spark amidst the abyss of the unknown and unknowable." The wording is unchanged in the *Fortnightly Review* (p. 633), in *Lay Sermons* (p. 12), and in *Method and Results* (p. 33).

It seems likely that Hutton was not in error in giving the word "agnostic" an etymology variant from Huxley's; that the word

⁷ First printed in 1893 as *Collected Essays*, Vol. I.

⁸ First published in 1894 under the title *Science and Christian Tradition*.

⁹ *Science and Christian Tradition*, p. 311. The footnote was noted by Clodd, *Thomas Henry Huxley*, p. 125, but he did not investigate the matter further.

¹⁰ "Agnosticism and Christianity," *Nineteenth Century*, xxv, 938.

derives either from the *ἀγνώστος* of Acts, or partly from it and partly from an antithesis to "gnostic"; and that it was Huxley who confused matters and then later refused to assert that because God was so far unknown, he was also unknowable. A final note of significance concerning the problem is that Hutton affirmed his account as late as 1895, when, in an article that appeared in the *Forum* several months after Huxley died, he said that Huxley "sympathized with those Athenians who had set up an altar 'Ἀγνώστῳ Θεῷ' 'to the unknown God,'—the incident related in the Acts of the Apostles,—from which he borrowed for himself the name of Agnostic."¹¹

University of Florida

GEORGE W. HALLAM

The Murders of Doyle and Eliot

Although T. S. Eliot is known to be an admirer of Sir Arthur Conan Doyle's great detective, apparently attention has never been called to the fact that ten lines of *Murder in the Cathedral* are taken with very little alteration from the Sherlock Holmes adventure "The Musgrave Ritual." In Part I of *Murder in the Cathedral* this stichomythy occurs:

THOMAS
Whose was it?

TEMPTER
His who is gone.

THOMAS
Who shall have it?

TEMPTER
He who will come.

THOMAS
What shall be the month?

TEMPTER
The last from
the first.

THOMAS
What shall we give for it?

¹¹ "Professor Huxley," *The Forum*, xx, 28.

TEMPTER
Pretence of
priestly power.

THOMAS
Why should we give it?

TEMPTER
For the power
and the glory.

As "The Musgrave Ritual" first appeared in the May, 1893, issue of *Strand Magazine*¹ and almost immediately afterward in the United States in the May 13 issue of *Harper's Weekly*,² it contained the following colloquy as part of the Musgrave Ritual:

Whose was it?
His who is gone.
Who shall have it?
He who will come.
.
.
.
.
.
What shall we give for it?
All that is ours.
Why should we give it?
For the sake of the trust.

When, late in 1893, the story was published in England in the collection called *The Memoirs of Sherlock Holmes*,³ the following question and answer were interpolated in the ceremony after the line "He who will come":

What was the month?
The sixth from the first.

This addition has since customarily appeared in English publications. But, following the example of the first book-form publication of the *Memoirs* in the United States (Harper and Brothers', also late in 1893), all American issues of the *Memoirs* and all American Holmes omnibus editions have failed to include the emendation until the three volumes entitled *The Adventures of Sherlock Holmes*, under the editorship of Edgar W. Smith, were printed for the members of the Limited Editions Club in 1950. Eliot's source for the ten lines of *Murder in the Cathedral* must, therefore, have been a book published in England which contained the revised text of "The

¹ v, 479-89.

² xxxvii, 453-55, 458.

³ The Strand Library, London, George Newnes, 1894 [sic], pp. 99-120.

Musgrave Ritual." That Eliot first read the story in such a form cannot be proved. However, he made some remarks about Holmes⁴ on the occasion of the publication in London of Murray's *The Complete Sherlock Holmes Short Stories*, which first appeared in October, 1928, and was reprinted for the second time in March, 1929. Thus we know of a volume in which Eliot had opportunity to see all the ten lines that he adapted to his purposes. And what were his purposes? Indeed, what Eliot did was to take ten lines of the cryptic family ceremony which Doyle had invented to convey the knowledge of a hiding place from one generation to the next and transform them into the crisis of Thomas à Becket's struggle with his Second Tempter. In Doyle the mysterious possession is the crown which "once encircled the brows of the Royal Stuarts"; in Eliot it is temporal power. In Doyle the first two questions and answers refer to Charles I and his successor on the throne; in Eliot they refer to Becket the Chancellor and his successor in the position of dominance in the kingdom. In Doyle the third question and answer suggest the month of the concealment of the crown;⁵ in Eliot they are altered so that they reveal the month of Becket's impending martyrdom. In Doyle the last two questions and answers allude to the sacred obligation of the Musgraves to their king; in Eliot the answers are altered so that the questions and answers present the sacrifice of spiritual authority for worldly might.⁶

University of Illinois

CONSTANCE NICHOLAS

⁴*The Criterion*, VIII (1929), 552-56.

⁵These two lines were added to "The Musgrave Ritual," no doubt, in an attempt to correct a defect in the original plot. As Christopher Morley has pointed out, "Another problem is whether Watson realized that the Ritual would only be correct at a season of the year when the sun's declination was the same as at the date of the original formula" ([Sir Arthur Conan Doyle], *Sherlock Holmes and Dr. Watson, A Textbook of Friendship*, ed. Christopher Morley, New York [1944], pp. 354-55.) It is strange that half the problem was solved—the season at the time of the original formula was supplied—but no hint is given of the season during which Holmes discovered the meaning of the formula and found the treasure.

⁶I am indebted to Mr. Frederic Dannay, of the Ellery Queen collaboration, for his kind response to my questions about his copy of the true first American edition of the *Memoirs*.

Simms's Porgy and Cooper

Although there has been considerable speculation as to what literary character contributed most to Simms's first conception of Porgy,¹ the character (or characters) can probably be found in the fiction of James Fenimore Cooper. *The Spy* (1821), Cooper's first and most popular novel dealing with the American Revolution, is in many ways like *The Partisan* (1835), Simms's first novel about the American Revolution and the first novel in which Porgy appears. In spite of many differences, the number of parallels is striking. Both novels deal with the Revolution in 1780, especially the bitter partisan strife and cruelty. Both have a conventional hero in love with a conventional heroine. In *The Spy*, the beautiful Frances Wharton, who is living with her widowed father and an unmarried aunt, tells her beloved cousin, Major Peyton Dunwoodie, that, if he will free her Tory brother, she will marry him that very day. In *The Partisan* the beautiful Katharine Walton, who is living with her widowed father and an unmarried aunt, tells her beloved cousin, Major Robert Singleton, that, if he will rescue her father, she will marry him at any time after he succeeds in the rescue. In *The Spy* the brother is rescued from prison a few hours before he is to be hanged. In *The Partisan* the father is rescued a few moments before he is to be hanged. In both novels are a Negro servant who is used for comic relief; an insane person; and a young woman, the sister of an American officer, who dies a pathetic death. Both novels also have an officer who, although brave and capable in battle, enjoys eating and talking about eating, possesses a keen sense of humor, likes poetry and music, and at times talks very wisely about life. These men are Captain Lawton and Lieutenant Porgy.

Both Lawton and Porgy are Southern gentlemen serving as officers in the American army; both are accompanied by a Negro servant. Both men are unusually large. Lawton is of "colossal stature" (p. 56) and has a "gigantic form" (p. 411).² Porgy is a "perfect mountain of flesh" (p. 98).³ But the distinguishing characteristic of both is that they are gourmands. Porgy's fondness for eating is emphasized in the first chapter in which he appears: "Nothing

¹ C. Hugh Holman, "Simms and the British Dramatists," *PMLA*, LXV (1950), 359.

² All references to Cooper's novels are to the Mohawk ed. (New York, n. d.).

³ All references to Simms's *The Partisan* are to the edition published by A. C. Armstrong (New York, 1882).

short of absolute necessity could have moved either of them at that moment—the former being busied with a rasher of bacon and a hoe-cake hot from the fire” (Ch. X, p. 116. The “former” is Porgy). Simms also states that Porgy “thought of eating perpetually, and, while he ate, still thought” (p. 110). Porgy’s animated conversations rarely deviate far from the subject of food (especially in chapters X, XXIII, and XXX). Lawton’s fondness for food is likewise emphasized in the chapter in which he first appears. He “suspended for a moment his violent attacks on the buckwheat cakes”; he “resumed his breakfast with an eagerness that created a doubt whether he ever expected to enjoy another”; he is handed a “fourth dish of coffee”; and he commences “anew on a fresh supply of cakes” (Ch. V, pp. 61-62). Later, when Lieutenant Mason says, “Oh! you won’t die if you can think of eating,” Lawton replies: “I should surely die if I could not” (p. 118). His delightful anticipation of a feast is described in detail (p. 161), and his animation at a convivial gathering culminates in his singing a song of the *carpe diem* type (p. 199).

Another significant similarity between Lawton and Porgy is the relationship of each to the physician accompanying the troopers. Lawton enjoys teasing Dr. Sitgreaves. Their discussions and arguments occur frequently (especially in chapters IX, XI, XVI, and XX). Porgy also enjoys teasing Dr. Oakenburg (especially in chapters X and XXXIII), in whose company he first appears in *The Partisan*. Both Sitgreaves and Oakenburg are lean, in contrast to Lawton and Porgy, their fat companions, and both could be classified as “humour” characters: Sitgreaves is unusually fond of dissections and surgical operations and of talking about them: Oakenburg has an abnormal interest in snakes.

Although Lawton enjoys eating as much as Porgy does, Porgy talks about food much more frequently than Lawton; and in this one respect Porgy is more like Cooper’s Captain Polwarth—a British officer in *Lionel Lincoln* (1825)—than he is like Lawton. Yvor Winters, referring to Polwarth as “a gentleman by birth and courageous by nature, but stout, overfond of eating and somewhat talkative,” concludes that Polwarth “must beyond any question be the prototype of W. G. Simms’ Porgy.”⁴ It would be difficult for anyone who compares the conversations of Polwarth about food

⁴ *In Defense of Reason* (New York, 1947), p. 194.

(in chapters IV, VII, IX, XIV, XXV, and XXVII of *Lionel Lincoln*) with Porgy's remarks about food (in chapters X, XXIII, and XXX of *The Partisan*) to doubt the probable influence of the British Polwarth on the American Porgy. In most respects, however, Porgy is more like Lawton than like Polwarth.

Simms, in praising *The Spy* "as the best attempt at historical romance which had ever been made in America," asserts that the character of the Spy "was not the only good one of the book. Lawton and Sitgreaves were both good conceptions" (pp. 211-212).⁵ After stressing the great popularity of *The Spy*, Simms emphasizes the important effect of this "upon the intellect of our own country. It at once opened the eyes of our people to their own resources" (p. 216). Thus Simms's own words furnish additional proof of the probable impact of *The Spy* on Simms's imagination as he wrote his first novel of the American Revolution. Since Porgy is more like Lawton than he is like Falstaff or any other literary character whose claims have so far been advanced as a prototype of Porgy, and since his fondness for talking about food is equaled or surpassed by Polwarth's similar fondness, it is logical to conclude that Simms, as he wrote his first novel in which Porgy appears, was influenced in his conception of Porgy more by Cooper than by any other writer.

Furman University

EDWARD P. VANDIVER, JR.

Emerson as a Creator of Vignettes

As research and criticism concentrate upon the art of his essays and poems, Emerson will doubtless become increasingly acknowledged as a master of vignettes that exhibit a remarkable range of tone and feeling. The majority of readers would probably select "Days" as the culmination of his art in the small picture; but this dream-vision, with its perfect rendering of image and mood in verses of the most consummate gravity, reminds one that Emerson also loved to describe the day in its physical as well as its symbolical aspect. Both the "Divinity School Address" and the essay "Nature" open with descriptions of a day; and the luxurious passage introducing the subject of the

⁵ *Views and Reviews in American Literature* (New York, 1845).

prose discourse invites the reader to entertain Emerson's philosophical remarks against the background of the refulgent summer or the pure October weather.

Though merely in passing, we have touched upon two obviously important facets of the study of Emerson's vignettes: we may regard and comment upon the art of the finished piece in itself, or we may further note its artistic function in a larger composition, whether prose or verse. This article will, however, take another direction and follow the emergence of one of these miniatures in verse out of the raw materials of prose; here the interest will concentrate upon Emerson's poetic purpose in deletions, additions, and transpositions—all the changes that were intended to secure metrical cadence, a sharpening of imagery, and purity of tone and mood. For this purpose "April," a charming little poem that considerably altered the prose, will serve as an admirable illustration.

The source of this poem ("The April winds are magical")¹ is Emerson's prose rhapsody in a letter to Margaret Fuller, dated February 21, 1840. Between the MS of the letter and the fair copy of the poem in verse-book *ETE* there intervene a draft of a portion of the letter in journal *S*, the first rough draft of the verses on a single sheet of blue paper, three drafts in verse-book *NP*, and a fair copy in verse-book *Rhymer*.² The portion of the letter inspiring these verses reads thus:

These spring winds are magical in their operation on our attuned frames. These are the days of passion when the air is full of cupids & devils for eyes that are still young; and every pool of water & every dry leaf & refuse straw seems to flatter, provoke, mock, or pique us. I who am not young have not yet forgot the enchantment, & still occasionally see dead leaves & wizards that peep & mutter. Let us surrender ourselves for fifteen minutes to the slightest of these nameless influences—these nymphs or imps of wood & flood of pasture & roadside, and we shall quickly find out what an ignorant pretending old Dummy is Literature who has quite omitted all that we care to know—all that we have not said ourselves.

I value too the mnemonics of this season. I see plainly the old school-entry where at this time of year we spun tops and snapped marbles; and I see as plainly that life then was calendared by moments & not by days, threw itself into nervous knots or glittering hours, even as now, & not spread itself abroad an equable felicity.³

¹ See *The Complete Works of Ralph Waldo Emerson* (Boston, 1903, Centenary ed.), IX, 255.

² I wish to thank the Ralph Waldo Emerson Memorial Association for permission to use MSS housed in the Houghton Library.

³ See Ralph L. Rusk's edition of *The Letters of Ralph Waldo Emerson*

but also made excisions from the first. He dropped the "devils," the "refuse straw," the "dead leaves & wizards that peep & mutter." He omitted the personal note, "I who am not young etc." What remained he condensed, especially toward the close of the paragraph; but some of the prose he had not yet altered, for example, "These are the days of passion." Finally, he added the last line about the south winds. Rough draft though they be, these verses nevertheless represent the severe boundaries within which Emerson intended to paint his little picture.

The first draft in *NP* (MS pages thirty-one and thirty-two) differs only slightly from the draft which we have just examined, but the changes represent the second stage in the creation of a poetic vignette out of the miscellaneous materials of a prose rhapsody. The first stage eliminated the undesirable elements; the second gathered the "pure" elements and gave them the unity of a local habitation:

The blithe May—
[Spring] winds are magical
And thrill our tuneful frames
The garden days are
[These are the days of] passionall
To bachelors & dames

*NP*², on MS page thirty, is the first complete draft, for here the wizards of the original prose returned as "Puck & goblin" to be expanded in *NP*³ (MS page forty-two) to "Goodfellow, Puck, & goblins." Also in *NP*² the magical winds were made to blow not in May but in April, and they remained April winds in all subsequent drafts. The crowning touch came likewise in *NP*² with the introduction of the beautiful Rosamond, the mistress of Henry II, who for her sake constructed a labyrinthine palace at Woodstock. Only those in the secret could be guided through the intricate maze by means of "a clue of thread," as the old ballad of "Fair Rosamond" has it. Emerson's unmistakable intention in using the name of this medieval beauty was to suggest the intoxication and allurement of nature in its effect on lovers. In *NP*² Emerson wrote "The cobweb clue of Rosamonds," which in *NP*³ he changed to "The clues of fairy Rosamonds"; and it is important to note that in both *Rhymer* (MS page seventy-five) and in *ETE* (MS page fifteen) he retained the correction of *NP*³. Subsequently, when he included "April" in his *Selected Poems* of 1876, he had it printed from the MS draft in *ETE*. For no discernible reason, when James Elliot Cabot brought out the poems in

the *Riverside* edition (ix, 219), he disregarded Emerson's final choice in this phrasing and went back to the "cobweb clues"; in the *Centenard* edition (ix, 255), Dr. Emerson accepted Cabot's judgment. Emerson's preferred reading should be restored, not only as a matter of editorial accuracy but also for the sake of the more deftly rounded artistic intent.

For this delicate evocation of the archaic and romantic, paradoxically inspired by the rustic details of American life, we need not seek far in any particular source. Thomas Warton, in his *The History of English Poetry* referred to the Rosamond story, both Bishop Percy, in his *Reliques*, and Joseph Ritson, in his *Ancient Songs and Ballads*, printed the old ballad of "Fair Rosamond," and finally, in *Woodstock*, Sir Walter Scott employed the legend for background to his own tale and quoted three stanzas from the ballad as the epigraph for chapter XXXIV. Emerson was familiar with all this material and owned Percy in the first edition (London, 1765) as well as Ritson (London, 1829) and a set of the Waverley novels.⁴

Two concluding observations are in order. First, the MS evolution pointedly illustrates one of Emerson's dominant poetical habits—to purify and idealize the elements of prose experience. Secondly, this habit was supported and strengthened by his conscious adaptation, as I demonstrate elsewhere, of Neo-Platonic doctrine from Cudworth.⁵ Just as the plastic Nature (*natura naturans*) molds the passive, physical nature (*natura naturata*), so the poet, emulating the Demiurgus, may give shape and coherence to his artistic material; and Emerson's unerring skill in the small picture is clearly a demonstration of his own successful practice of this doctrine.

Lehigh University

CARL F. STRAUCH

⁴ For Emerson's borrowing of Percy's *Reliques* from 1820 onward, see Kenneth W. Cameron's *Emerson the Essayist* (Raleigh, N. C., 1945), II, 156, 159, 165-167, and also Cameron's *Ralph Waldo Emerson's Reading* (Raleigh, N. C., 1941), pp. 25-26; and for Warton, borrowed in 1835, see *Emerson's Reading*, p. 22.

⁵ See my forthcoming study, "The Year of Emerson's Poetic Maturity: 1834."

Two Uses of Maupassant by R. P. Warren

In *Understanding Fiction*, an anthology edited by Cleanth Brooks and Robert Penn Warren, there appears a translation of Guy de Maupassant's familiar story "The Necklace." At one point the heroine, Mme. Loisel, muses: "How life is strange and changeable! How little a thing is needed for us to be lost or to be saved!"¹ A question inserted by the editors in their interpretation of the story calls special attention to this passage: "Have we any evidence that the author intended to indicate a regeneration of the heroine?"² The implication, of course, is that Mme. Loisel was changed for the better and that she was saved.

Among the many quotations, from various literary works, which appear in Warren's novel *All the King's Men* is one from "The Necklace." Its source—and to a certain extent its significance—is somewhat obscured by the fact that the quotation is split into two parts. But each part refers to the same character, Slade. In the first chapter of the book, Slade refuses, despite the urging of the politician Tiny Duffy, to force beer on "Cousin Willie from the country," who prefers orange pop and who is to become Governor Willie Stark. Jack Burden, narrator of the novel, says: "Perhaps that was the moment when Slade made his fortune. How life is strange and changeable."³

Slade, proprietor of a drab speakeasy at the time, receives his reward after Repeal. At a time when Mack trucks are needed to carry liquor license applications from the post office to the State House, Slade gets his license immediately; for "Cousin Willie from the country" is now Governor Stark, who never forgets a favor.

The quotation from Maupassant is completed more than two hundred pages later. In Slade's cocktail lounge, looking at Slade in his expensively tailored tuxedo amid the soft lights, sweet music, and the gleam of chromium, Jack Burden "marveled how little is required for a man to be lost or saved."⁴ Like Mme. Loisel, Slade is saved.

There can be no doubt that the echo of Maupassant is deliberate. By directing attention to the passage, the editors of *Understanding*

¹ Cleanth Brooks and Robert Penn Warren, *Understanding Fiction* (New York, 1947), p. 125.

² Brooks and Warren, p. 127.

³ Robert Penn Warren, *All the King's Men* (New York, 1946), p. 20.

⁴ Warren, p. 255.

Fiction show that they attach much importance to it. In *All the King's Men* Warren's splitting of the quotation gives the incident of Slade and his fortunes increased emphasis and irony, once the source of Jack's musings is identified.

Wofford College

JAMES T. STEWART

A Footnote to Caroline's Letter of April 4, 1786

An amusing printing error occurs in the interesting contribution of Professor Mautner, "Zu Lichtenberg und Archenholtz" (*MLN*, *LXIX*, 189 ff.). There Caroline's letter to her sister of April 4, 1786, is quoted in part as reading, "es [Archenholtz' *England und Italien*] soll sehr amüſant und wahr ſeyn, und es iſt uns Dahmens viel daran gelegen" (*Caroline*, hg. E. Schmidt, I, 151). Both G. Waitz (*Caroline*, I, 36) and Schmidt have, ". . . es iſt uns *und* Dahmens viel daran gelegen." The reference is not to the fair sex but to Caroline Böhmer's relatives, Georg Christoph Hahme (clerical author, superintendent general in Clausthal, later in Celle, died June 20, 1808) and his English-born wife (cf. Letter to Luise Gotter, April 3, 1784), who are often mentioned in this fashion by Caroline. Schmidt does not identify them in the "Anmerkungen," although there are eight entries in the "Personenregister" under "Dahme, G. C." (II, 676, a). A footnote in Waitz also directs the reader to an apparently later Lichtenberg review of Archenholtz' work, "Gött. Gel. Anz. . . . 1787 St. 183" (I, 37).

University of Washington

ROBERT L. KAHN

Old French *sancier*, *essancier*

Old French *sancier* (*sanchier*) 'guérir, soulager, calmer,' and its compound *essancier* (*essanchier*) 'calmer en satisfaisant' are found in numerous texts of the thirteenth to the fifteenth centuries, all from north-eastern France: Baudouin de Condé, *Bauduin de Sebourc*, *le Bastart de*

Bouillon, Hugues Capet, Froissart, Chastellain. Tobler proposed as etymology VL **exemptiare*.¹ Gaston Paris,² admitting that Tobler's etymology might be acceptable for sense, points out, however, that the *an* syllable under the accent, never rhymes with *en*. In fact the word, in rhyme and outside, is always written with *an* in these texts of the northeast where the sounds *an* and *en* were differentiated. After examining the senses of *sancier*, *essancier* in a number of texts, Gaston Paris was convinced that these verbs were to be related etymologically to Latin *sanus* 'sound, whole, healthy (physically or mentally).' He proposed as etymological base a VL type **sanitiare*, **exsanitiare*, formed on **sanitia*, a supposed variant of *sanitas*. Objections to this derivation came from G. Gröber³ and M. S. Garner.⁴ Paris subsequently admitted the validity of these criticisms and says: "Je rattacherais maintenant *sancier* à *sano* (*sanare*) par un autre intermédiaire que **sanitia*."⁵ He never seems to have explained this "autre intermédiaire."

W. Meyer-Lübke (*REW* 7581)⁶ gives as etymology of OF *sancier*, *essancier*, the **sanitiare* of Paris but considers it to be "zweifelhaft." He rejects Tobler's **exemptiare* for the reasons set forth by Paris. I believe with the latter that the Latin verb *sano*, *sanare* 'to make sound, to heal, to cure, restore to health,' with extended senses 'correct, restore, allay, quiet,' is the source of OF *sancier* (*essancier*) which corresponds so closely to it in its various meanings.

Latin *sanare* in Vulgar Latin might well have had a past participle **sanitus*. Many verbs of the first conjugation in Latin had past participles in *-itus*: *crepitus* (*crepare*), *cubitus* (*cubare*), *domitus* (*domare*), *plicitus* (*plicare*), *sonitus* (*sonare*), *tonitus* (*tonare*), *vetitus* (*vetare*). In Vulgar Latin the formation of a past participle in *-itus* for verbs of the first conjugation is a fairly frequent phenomenon:⁷ **cavitus*, **excavitus* (*cavare*; *REW* 1792), **exlavitus* (*lavare*; *REW* 3020), *levitus* (*levare*; *REW* 5005), *provitus* (*probare*), *rogitus* (*rogare*), *vocitus*, *evocitus*, *provocitus* (*vocare* 'call'), **vocitus* (*vocare* = *vacare*;

¹ *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeiger* (1877), pp. 1622 ff.

² Article *sancier*, *essancier* in *Mélanges linguistiques publiés par Mario Roques* (Paris, 1909), pp. 608 ff.

³ *Zeitschr. f. rom. Phil.*, III, 314; cf. *Romania*, VIII, 631.

⁴ *American Journal of Philology*, I, 111-116.

⁵ *Mél. ling.*, 610, note 2.

⁶ *Romanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch* (3rd ed.; Heidelberg, 1935).

⁷ C. H. Grandgent, *Vulgar Latin* (Boston, 1907), p. 183, § 435; p. 184, § 439; W. Meyer-Lübke, *Die lateinische Sprache in den romanischen Ländern* in G. Gröber, *Grundriss der romanischen Philologie*, I (2), 480.

REW 9429), etc.⁸ On this Vulgar Latin past participle **sanitus* a new verb was formed with suffix *-iare*: **sanitiare*. Such verb formations on past participles with suffix *-iare* go back to the most remote periods of Vulgar Latin⁹: *captiare* (*captus*), **corruptiare* (*corruptus*), *directiare* (*directus*), **distractiare* (*distractus*), **pertusiare* (*pertusus*), *punctiare* (*punctus*), **raptiare* (*raptus*), *rectiare* (*rectus*), **subversiare* (*subversus*), **suctiare* (*suctus*), **tractiare* (*tractus*), etc.¹⁰ The sense of **sanitiare*, thus formed, was, as is usually the case in such derived verbs, about the same as that of the simple verb *sanare*. A VL **sanitiare*, thus conceived, would give quite regularly OF *sancier* (*essancier*).

There is a variant form *essancier* of *essancier*, found only in a *Vie de Saint Alexis* (c. 1200),¹¹ which I think may be quite naturally explained by analogy with semi-learned *sanité*, doublet of *santé* (*sanitatem*). To judge by its frequent occurrence in texts of various sorts throughout the middle ages, *sanité* was in common use. The relationship of OF *santé* and OF *sanité* to OF *sancier* (*essancier*) must have early been evident and might well have led to the popular creation in Old French of the lengthened *essancier*. The rarity of the latter seems to favor this hypothesis and to support the primary etymology: VL **sanitiare* > *sancier*.

Bowdoin College

CHARLES H. LIVINGSTON

⁸ Verbs like *cubare* (*couver*), *probare* (*prouver*), *vocare* (*vouer*), *levare* (*lever*) had also the normal past participle in *-atu*. *Sanare* would also be in this category, if we admit its past participle **sanitus* alongside of *sanatus*: cf. OF *saner*, *resaner* 'guérir' and past participle *sané* (Godefroy).

⁹ Antoine Thomas in *Dictionnaire général de la langue française* (Paris, 1938), p. 71.

¹⁰ As in the case of **sanitiare*, a verb **excavitiare*, formed on a past participle in *-itus* (*excavare*, **excavitus*; REW 1792), may account for Italian *scavizzolare* alongside of *scavitolare*.

¹¹ *Romania*, VIII, 163. *La vie de Saint Alexis en vers octosyllabiques*, verse 934 (p. 180). Gaston Paris later found a form *resancier* to which he did not give a text reference and which is not in Godefroy. It is apparently as rare in the texts as *essancier*; cf. *Mél. ling.*, 610, note 2.

Some Unpublished Letters of Emile Deschamps, Public Functionary and Private Citizen

Henri Girard, author of two well-documented monographs on the "Jeune moraliste" of *la Muse française*, Emile Deschamps (*Un bourgeois dilettante à l'époque romantique* and *Emile Deschamps dilettante*, both published in Paris, 1921) seems to have been unaware of the existence of a forty-year correspondence between his subject and two very dear friends, Jules and Virginie de Croze. Nearly three hundred letters of Deschamps to the Crozes are now in the possession of the University of Texas library,¹ and they serve the double purpose of confirming and increasing our knowledge of the facts of his private and public life and of his reactions to the socio-political scene during the Restoration, the July Monarchy, the Second Republic and the Second Empire. The present article is based on extracts from some of the most interesting of these letters, written during the reign of Louis-Philippe.

Like his friend and literary associate in the founding of the "école romantique," Victor Hugo, Emile Deschamps was an enthusiastic supporter of the July Revolution. This fact is attested to by the letters he wrote the Crozes and other close friends like the poet Jules de Rességuier² during the second half of the year 1830. Disillusionment set in swiftly, however, and it drew him away from the more liberal of his Romantic colleagues to the side of the ultra-Legitimists, some of whom had either voluntarily resigned or had been dismissed from their governmental posts by the new régime.³ A Parisian to the very depths of his being, he nevertheless thought seriously of asking for a transfer from the position in the Administration des Domaines which he had held in the capital for more than fifteen years. He had learned that the *direction* of the office of this agency in the town of Le Puy, *chef-lieu* of the department of the Haute-Loire and thus not far from the Crozes' château de

¹ This collection is described in my article, "Unpublished Letters of Emile Deschamps," *The Library Chronicle of the University of Texas*, vol. IV, no. 3 (Summer 1952), pp. 112-117. See also *MLN*, LXVIII (1953), pp. 145-150.

² For the correspondence with Rességuier on this subject, see Girard, *Un bourgeois dilettante*, pp. 290-293.

³ Jules de Croze, for example, after having been named prefect of the Basses-Alpes in April 1830, left Digne, *chef-lieu* of the department, in rather undignified haste and retired to private life, spending most of each year thereafter at his château de Chassaigne near Brioude in the Haute-Loire (Auvergne) and the remainder in Paris.

Chassaigne near Brioude, was about to become vacant and he took steps to obtain the appointment. For one reason or another, he kept such complete silence on this matter that his biographer, Girard, makes no mention of it whatsoever. The Crozes were among the very few people who knew of it, as we learn from letters written them in 1831. Typical is a rather long letter dated February 7, from which I quote a few statements:

On nous désorganise; et avec la crainte de moins d'appointements, la certitude d'un avenir bouché, j'ai l'ennui d'un surcroît d'ouvrage qui me ferait encore plus désirer la Direction du Puy, si vous le vouliez réellement tous les deux.—Sur ma demande, Monsieur le Directeur Général a déjà interrogé l'administrateur du personnel sur mes moyens et ma capacité. Il paraît que la réponse a été satisfaisante. . . . En tout cas *motus* et grande discrétion dans tout ceci, avec tout le monde de Paris et là-bas, car tout dépend de la prudence et du silence.

Four days later he returned to the subject:

Oui, il est de mon intérêt et beaucoup de demander une Direction. Ce serait un immense avantage pour le présent et surtout pour mon avenir.—Et cependant, mes chers et parfaits amis, sans vous, sans le voisinage de Chassaigne, je jure Dieu que jamais la pensée de quitter Paris ne me fût venue.—C'est donc vous qui me forcez, par la tendresse que je vous porte, à poursuivre jusqu'au bout une carrière où mon père ne s'est pas arrêté. C'est vous qui me remettez dans la ligne du devoir; car c'en est un de suivre autant qu'on le peut les traces de son père, et de parcourir de son mieux la lice où il vous a lancé.⁴

Deschamps continued for several months to write hopefully of this project, but nothing came of it, and he was to remain at his post in Paris until 1845, when he retired on his pension to Versailles, where he died a quarter of a century later.

The nervous disorders which made of Antoni Deschamps, translator of Dante and author of several volumes of original verse, an intermittent resident, for nearly forty years, of the "maison de santé du Dr. Blanche" at Montmartre were shared, in some degree, by his older brother Emile.⁵ Though he survived all his colleagues of *la Muse française*, with the exception of Hugo, Emile Deschamps continually complained, and almost to the point of hypochondria, of a variety of physical ailments and, less frequently, of mental distress. On August 8, 1841, for instance, he wrote the Crozes:

⁴ For the administrative career of Jacques Deschamps de Saint-Amand (1741-1826), father of Emile and Antoni, see Girard, *op. cit.*, pp. 9 *et seq.*

⁵ On this subject, see Girard, pp. 347-350.

Merci de vos gronderies et de vos inquiétudes. Et parlez-moi beaucoup de vous.—J'aime mieux ne pas trop vous parler de nous. Je me remets, je retombe, je traîne, je languis, je me rallume et m'éteins. C'est un être tout détraqué que votre pauvre Emile, et j'en suis plus triste pour Aglaé [i. e., Mme Deschamps] et mes amis que pour moi qui ne m'intéresse plus à moi le moins du monde. Cependant, je travaille encore et beaucoup, tout plaisir m'étant hostile.

A year later, on September 4, 1842, he penned a letter, one of the strangest documents in this entire collection, which testifies to a mental state reminiscent of that of Gérard de Nerval at about this same period. In the midst of a very long and rambling report on a great many of their common friends, Deschamps has the following to say of his own condition:

Aglaé se porte assez bien; elle a du courage et ne se dément pas un instant. Il lui en faut, car je ne reprends pas vite le dessus et la direction de moi-même. Je ne souffre pas, je ne change pas, je dors et mange bien, je puis travailler—mais le centre du moi est blessé et l'équilibre humain rompu. Et c'est un état de consommation et de deuil intérieur et de désespoir continu qui fait que je suis indifférent à moi-même. C'est une maladie ainsi faite—la pire de toutes, sans remède physique ni moral, ni religieux, puisque je ne sens plus, à force d'avoir senti. C'est l'homme retourné, un être qui survit. Je suis mort le 27 juin, 1842, à quatre heures et quart, sur le Quai Voltaire, en lisant une page d'un livre que je n'indiquerai jamais et qui m'a tellement bouleversé que la mort de l'âme s'en est suivie instantanément. C'est la vérité pure. Mon idée (?) est restée frappée, pétrifiée, et refroidie, je ne sais comment ni pourquoi. J'ai la force et le courage (car j'en avais une fameuse dose) de singer encore la vie devant le monde. Mais au fond je me sens perdu sans espoir—et perdu par le seul endroit qui pût m'atteindre. Car, les souffrances physiques, les chagrins même, . . . je dominais et je portais tout cela. Vous l'avez vu, me suis-je jamais plaint? C'est qu'en effet je n'étais pas à plaindre malgré bien des maux. C'est que j'avais une force plus grande que les maux. A présent, une paille m'accablerait. La question d'équilibre est tout. Un bon estomac digère du jambon et des haricots, un mauvais est en convulsion pour un morceau d'échaudé. Jugez quand c'est l'organisation entière qui ne vaut rien. Et cependant, j'ai bon visage. Eh! mon Dieu, lorsque les ressorts d'une montre sont dérangés, le cadran a fort bonne mine encore. Mais en regardant bien, on s'aperçoit que les aiguilles vont tout de travers, en attendant qu'elles n'aillent plus du tout. Et puis, où est l'horloger de la montre humaine? Dans l'éternité. Encore une fois, c'est une maladie ainsi faite, dont on meurt fort bien—hélas! ou dont on vit fort mal. . . . Mon état est celui d'une grande et affreuse terreur. Supposez-vous dans la plus horrible angoisse que vous ayez jamais éprouvée. Supposez que vous voyez un être que vous chérissez le plus, suspendu sur un précipice, supposez même (ce qui est moins, mais encore très suffisant) que c'est vous qui êtes suspendu ainsi; et puis, que dans un moment il vous

faillie vous occuper des choses ordinaires de la vie. Eh bien, ce moment me dure depuis quinze mois! Et je dissimule avec mille supercheries pour ne pas tuer Aglaé. Je ne sais pas pourquoi je vous dis cela . . . à vous. C'est que je suis loin et je pense que . . . vous ne croirez pas tout! Peut-être guérirai-je d'ailleurs. Il y a des exemples, mais il y en a davantage de contraires, et cette alternative m'enlève toute confiance, tout désir, tout projet.

To offset this picture of a normally rational and cheerful man teetering on the brink of complete insanity, I cite an incident which occurred much earlier than the above-described fit of melancholia and which Deschamps obviously found very amusing. It is recounted in a letter dated August 2, 1832, where we read:

Que je vous dise une drôle de chose. Tout le monde sait combien je ressemble à M. Portal,⁶ presque autant que le magnifique portrait qu'en vient de faire M. de Champmartin. Eh! bien, mon pauvre sosie vient de mourir, avant que son peintre ait mis à son portrait *la dernière main*. C'est à la lettre, *la dernière main*. La main gauche n'est pas achevée, et on me fait l'honneur de me faire poser ce soir pour terminer le portrait et ajouter le dernier trait de ressemblance. On trouve mes vieux doigts et tout moi assez décharnés pour cela. Je n'aurais donc pas perdu dix ans de ma vie à faire le Portal [an obvious pun on "faire antichambre"]!

The after-effects of the accession of Louis-Philippe to the throne as "roi des Français"—the assumption of control by the bourgeoisie and the attendant outbreaks of violence in the laboring class—are reflected in many of the letters written during the first years of the July Monarchy. On February 6, 1834, Deschamps voices a feeling of hopelessness with regard to the possibility of an orderly settlement, by normal legislative procedures, of the class conflict and the prevalent apathy in certain circles towards political questions:

Il est vrai que l'hiver est terrible ici. Jamais je n'ai vu tant de bals, de concerts, de réunions, etc. Je passe ma vie à refuser tout cela et il m'en reste encore mille fois trop. Il est de fait que c'est une rage de luxe et de plaisir comme on en vit sous le Directoire après la Terreur! Comme alors, la fatigue politique se fait sentir. Excepté les journalistes et les députés, personne à Paris ne s'occupe des affaires publiques. Il y a un sursis. Tant

⁶ Baron Antoine Portal (1742-1832), whose portrait was painted in the last year of his life by Charles-Emile Callande de Champmartin, one of the most successful portraitists of the period, and exhibited at the Salon of 1833. Champmartin's name, almost always in conjunction with that of the even more prominent portrait-painter, Mme de Mirbel, is frequently mentioned in Deschamps's letters to the Crozes. This is not surprising, since Champmartin executed a portrait of Deschamps himself which was exhibited at the Salon of 1840 as well as one of Mme de Croze's father, M. Lemerrier, while Mme de Mirbel painted a group-picture of Mme de Croze and her children. For Callande de Champmartin, see Girard, *Emile Deschamps dilettante*, pp. 14-15.

mieux, quand une chose n'est ni belle, ni bonne, il vaut mieux, quand on le peut, n'y point penser, et porter ses idées et sa passion vers les choses d'art, de cœur et de nature, que Dieu met toujours à notre portée, sous tous les régimes. Ainsi fait-on à Paris. . . . C'est au point que dans notre société intime, nous avons fait serment de ne plus lire de journaux. Nous avons renvoyé nos abonnements. Cela m'a fait un grand vide d'abord. Maintenant je n'y pense plus. C'est vraiment un héroïsme bizarre dans ce siècle.

Under these circumstances, Deschamps took refuge in artistic avocations, on some of which he wrote lengthy reports to his friends. One of these, dated March 26, 1836, is concerned, among other things, with a masked ball at the Opéra:

Chère Virginie, non, Aglaé et votre belle-soeur ne se sont pas très amusées au bal de l'Opéra. Elles avaient peur des masques et se sont tenues dans une loge trop longtemps. Cependant elles commençaient à s'enhardir et à se divertir quand il a fallu s'en aller. C'est toujours ainsi. Quant à moi, j'ai retrouvé avant-hier dans une grande soirée quatre des dominos qui m'ont si bien intrigué. Ce sont de fort belles et grandes dames, françaises et étrangères, qui m'ont avoué que j'avais été très sot et très grognon. Je leur ai dit pour m'excuser que j'étais à cent lieues de croire que ce pouvait être elles.

A little farther on in the letter we learn the identity of these "belles et grandes dames étrangères":

L'autre soir la princesse Galitzine (un de mes dominos, par parenthèse) me présenta à sa soeur, Mme de Miatlew, et M. de Miatlew, le mari, me reconnut pour avoir vu mon portrait à St.-Pétersbourg.⁷ Et alors il m'apprit (car il est, à ce qu'il paraît, un grand poète russe) qu'il y a deux ans il avait traduit en vers russes mes *Etudes françaises*, et dès le lendemain il m'envoya (n'ayant pas ici d'exemplaires) quelques pièces manuscrites de la traduction russe, croyant apparemment que je savais sa langue comme lui la mienne. Alors, . . . je lui répondis sur-le-champ ces quelques vers: no. 1. Et puis je cours chez le prince Elim, et je le priaï de me traduire mot à mot quelques pièces originales de M. de Miatlew, pour les traduire, moi, en vers français, et vous en avez un échantillon dans la pièce no. 2. J'ai envoyé tout cela dans le même souvenir (?) et je me suis un peu acquitté.

On September 23, 1841, Deschamps drew a cheerless picture of the socio-political situation and then suggested a source of consolation. He wrote:

⁷The princess Alexis Galitzine was a sister-in-law of the Russian poet, Ivan Petrovitch Miatlev (see Girard, *Un bourgeois dilettante*, pp. 370, 372, 377, 378) to whom Deschamps addressed a poem, "A M. de Miatlew, qui a traduit mes poésies en russe" (*Œuvres complètes*, 6 vols.; [Paris: Lemerre, 1872-1874], *Poésie* I, pp. 136-137). For prince Elim Mestscherski, the salon of his mother, and his relations with Deschamps, see Girard, *op. cit.*, pp. 373-384. The poems which Deschamps tells the Crozes he is enclosing in this letter are not in the University of Texas collection.

Il est possible que nous chantions et dansions sur un volcan. Voilà cinquante ans que c'est ainsi, et cela vaut mieux que de prendre des précautions souvent inopportunes. Si on ferme les fenêtres, . . . les voleurs entrent par la cheminée. Nous ne savons rien, Dieu sait tout. L'orage vient du calme et le calme de la tempête. Soyons confiants dans la providence . . . et aimons-nous.

Then, in happier vein, he proceeds:

Nous sommes allés hier à St.-Denis pour la réception du grand et magnifique orgue. La cérémonie a été manquée, comme toujours, mais à peine le ministère et l'Institut partis, nous avons eu un plaisir énorme. M. l'abbé Certes, maintenant chanoine de St.-Denis, a fait voir à toute notre société les belles curiosités de St.-Denis, et les travaux d'architecture, de peinture, et de vitraux que l'on achève. En vérité, tous ces arts que l'on croyait perdus ressuscitent de nos jours à s'y tromper. En toutes choses, la France est grande sous son pauvre gouvernement. C'est une anomalie et un contresens inexplicables. Quant à l'orgue (composé de six mille tuyaux et de quatre-vingts jeux—tonnerre, trompette, flute, voix humaine, vent de la mer, etc.), l'orgue de Fribourg, au dire de quelques ecclésiastiques qui se trouvaient là, ne sera plus que le second. L'auteur nous en a montré tous les *intestins*; cela confond l'imagination. Puis les meilleurs artistes de Paris en ont joué pendant une heure. Nous ne pouvions plus nous en arracher. Maintenant on est en train de liarder avec l'auteur d'un pareil monument, qui a fait en deux ans ce qu'il fallait dix ans autrefois pour faire.

C'est aux arts, à l'amitié, après la religion, à vous consoler de la politique à laquelle malheureusement on ne peut rien . . . et que l'on peut empirer encore en cherchant à la guérir. Les mauvais siècles politiques sont les maladies des peuples, et elles durent cent ans en leur qualité de siècles.

The above extracts are obvious products of the state of mind of a man caught between the prosaic routine of the public functionary and the creative urges of the poet and of that of a private citizen who looked to the future for the improvement of society but was riveted to the past by ties of friendship and by his pride in the glories of his country's achievements. Deschamps's desire to seek shelter, in times of personal or national storm-and-stress, in the arts and in enduring human relationships counterbalanced his inability to take a firm stand on the pressing political and social problems of the age; and this may explain the fact that, though he was far outstripped by such of his fellows of the Romantic cohort as Lamartine, Vigny, and Hugo, he survives as an embodiment of the conflicting and often tumultuous forces which fashioned the culture and the history of nineteenth-century France.

University of Texas

AARON SCHAFFER

Fragments by Jean Giraudoux

Between 1904, when "Le Dernier Rêve d'Edmond About"¹ appeared in the December 16 issue of *Marseille-Etudiant*, and 1909, when *Provinciales* was published, Giraudoux's bibliographical record is still vague² and incomplete. The volume edition of his newspaper stories³ added, however, a good number of titles, and just recently we learn of *Conversations Canadiennes*,⁴ a short account of a trip to Canada. Other texts will surely come to light, such as the two I wish to present here.⁵

An obscure little periodical, the *Athéna, Revue de Lettres et d'Art*, carried in its January 1906 number three pieces entitled "Trois Fragments" and signed by Giraudoux's pseudonym, Jean-Emmanuel Manière. The second one, "De mon banc," reappeared as one of the "Allégories" in *Provinciales* ("Le Printemps"), but the first⁶ and the third are entirely new to me. Probably Giraudoux did not consider them worth republishing, but students and amateurs of the author of *Siegfried et le Limousin* may welcome these additions to their bibliography and be curious to read two of his earliest efforts.

Echo

C'était moins un cortège qu'une procession; par deux, d'un pas empesé, presque au pas, la noce défilait devant les ormes comme elle avait défilé devant le bourg. En arrière-garde, le piston et la clarinette, au silence, avec leurs blouses ridées comme des binious dégonflés. En extrême-garde, deux gamins muets qui se donnaient et se balançaient la main.

La mariée s'arrêta brusquement, pour reboutonner les manchettes du marié,

¹ See my discussion of this work in "Jean Giraudoux, Hoffman, and Le Dernier Rêve d'Edmond About," *Revue de littérature comparée*, xxiv (1950), 103-7.

² I have been unable to trace satisfactorily the various editions of "Le Dernier Rêve d'Edmond About" entitled subsequently "Premier Rêve signé" or locate all the stories of *Provinciales* that first appeared in reviews. Bibliographers and memorialists are unspecific and in disagreement. The reviews in question are generally unavailable.

³ *Contes d'un Matin* (Gallimard, 1952). I have discussed these findings in the "Remarques liminaires" to the volume and in an article "Forgotten Stories of Jean Giraudoux," *French Review*, xxiv (1950), 97-104.

⁴ See Will L. McLendon, "En partant d'un texte oublié de Giraudoux: Le thème de l'évasion," *French Review*, xxvii (1953), 30-35.

⁵ One copy of the review in which these pieces were printed is among Jean Giraudoux's own papers. His son, Jean-Pierre Giraudoux, graciously permitted me to have them photographed.

⁶ Talvart and Place indicate that "Echo" was subsequently once included in a deluxe edition of *Provinciales. Bibliographie des Auteurs modernes*, vii, 138.

dont les boutons étaient à contre-sens. Le cahot arrêta la noce, et tous les ventres choquèrent des dos. On repartit; les distances et l'harmonie se rétablissaient, quand les garçons d'honneur, facétieux, cessèrent doucement de suivre les époux: le couple distrait continua dix pas, puis tourna des yeux effarés, puis dit: "Oh, c'est fin!" puis revint, honteux, s'atteler au cortège qu'il traîna jusqu'à la vallée.

Avant de regripper, la noce fit halte sur le pont de pierre, debout, sans rompre ses rangs, comme un train au repos sur ses rails. Seule, la clarinette s'assit sur le parapet; elle dominait la noce, la rivière, le ciel que l'on voyait au fond de la rivière: elle aspirait sans hâte le bel air bleu, qui anime les clarinettes, et dit.

"—J'ai bien une idée."

et ajouta:

"Si tout le monde faisait parler l'Echo, mes cocos?" La noce se numérotait donc, selon la qualité, l'âge ou le sexe, et chacun, s'accoudant au parapet, face aux montagnes, chercha pour Echo une pensée définitive.

L'Echo, grêle, comme si les collines étaient fêlées, riposta à la mariée:

"Me voilà mariée."

Le mari de la mariée sourit. Mais il manqua éclater quand l'écho spirituel lui répondit:

"Voilà ma femme mariée."

Et peu à peu, l'écho assoupi s'éveilla, et prit son parti de l'aventure. C'était un vieil écho, que les ans et les pluies assourdisaient. Un maquignon l'avait découvert, bien avant la construction du pont, en injuriant ses génisses, qui dansaient au milieu du gué, par peur de leurs ombres.

Il répondit au gosse: Bonjour.

A la gosse: Bonsoir.

Au 1^{er} témoin: Oh oh, oh oh.

Au 2^{me} témoin: Demi tour à droite, gauche.

A la clarinette, qui connaissait ses moindres finesses et avait crié: "Faut-il tirer le canon:"

Ah, non!

A Jeanne: Vive le père Ricard!

Le père, le vieux père, le vieux grand-père Ricard, retardé par ses rhumatismes, courbé sur sa canne, débouchait en effet du ravin.

A votre tour, père Ricard.

Il resta au milieu du pont, dans l'axe du chemin, pensa une minute, gratta son oreille, pensa une seconde fois, et cria de toutes ses forces:

"Haine de l'étranger, haine aux tyrans fatale,

"Couve toujours dans notre sein!

"Quand donc battra la générale?

"Quand donc sonnera le tocsin?

On attendait; l'écho ne répondit pas; le père Ricard fut vexé.

La clarinette excusa l'écho. "Il n'habitait pas les sabots du père Ricard; il habitait les collines, et non les sabots. C'était vers les collines que le grand-père devait se tourner, vers les collines où était née justement la mère du père Ricard. Mais l'écho n'habitait pas les sabots, ni les chaussettes, ni la route." On rit, ce qui permit au marié d'éclater à son aise.

Eh père Ricard, crie: La Barbe!

Eh père Ricard, crie: Des Nèfles!

Mais le vieux, immobile, rageur, répéta, s'arrêtant après chaque mot:

"Haine de l'étranger . . ."

L'écho ne renvoya la phrase ni en détail, ni en bloc. La noce remontait déjà vers le bourg, s'enfournant dans le terrier du chemin creux, petit à petit, avec des précautions, comme un renard qui a la queue trop longue. Le père Ricard attendit un long moment, courbé, silencieux, toujours au milieu du chemin, malgré la clarinette qui criait:

"Au parapet, grand-père, au parapet!" malgré la noce, qui chantait "au parapet" sur l'air des lampions, malgré l'écho qui répétait l'invite de la noce.

"Quand ils seront tous partis, pensait le vieux, je serai seul."

Quand il fut seul, il fit face à l'écho, s'avança vers lui jusqu'au garde-fou, regarda fixement les petites collines où la mère Ricard, voilà cent deux ans, était née, secoua les épaules, comme un tireur devant sa cible, et recria.

Mais l'air était si lourd qu'à vingt pas du pont les paroles, fatiguées ne pouvaient avancer ni revenir.

Alors il s'arcbouta aux mousses de ses mains rugueuses, ferma à demi les yeux, comme pour prier, ajusta sa bouche, et l'ouvrit.

Mais le piston le devança, ordonnant et meublant le silence; le piston, ouaté comme une flûte, aux tons mineurs, aigus, aux angles de la mazurka, comme une clarinette. Il flûtait lentement, heureux de s'entendre, si sûr de chanter seul et de régner pendant tout le solo. Il s'attardait, mais l'on devinait auprès, tout près, la clarinette impatiente; elle gloussa soudain, toussa, siffla une minute au ton du piston, et rageuse, suivit l'allure, virant au galop, montant à l'aigu quand l'ami descendait au grave, et l'on sut alors ce que c'est qu'une clarinette. Le piston rattrapé résista: le duo s'engagea, un vrai duel, avec des feintes et des parades. Le chemin creux en résonna, puis le bois, puis le petit pont à écho, puis l'écho.

Le père Ricard releva la tête, frappa de la main le parapet, le refrappa de son bâton, et cria:

"N . . . de D . . . , allez-vous vous taire!"

Mais les musiciens soufflaient et soufflaient, sourds comme l'écho. Une seconde encore, le vieux se demanda si n . . . de d . . . ils allaient se taire, mais le duo accaparait les échos, les mille échos des collines Ricard, les mille échos de la rivière, qui volèrent une minute au-dessus des remous, y tombent, épuisés, et s'y perdent en écueme.

Le père Ricard suivit donc la noce, sur un gazon à paquerettes où les sabots ne sonnaient pas.

Les Rides

Elles dormaient au creux de nos mains d'enfant, oisives, et se sautant à l'aventure. A l'ombre des doigts demi-fermés, elles indiquaient aux mères liseuses la vie, les menus accidents, et les bonheurs à venir. La nuit, elles s'enroulaient au fond des paumes lasses, s'étiraient au matin, fraîches et salées, et les petits chats les léchaient. Une respiration égale gonflait le corps; la peau sans replis tenait à la chair comme un maillot. Longtemps elles cherchèrent en vain à s'échapper des mains; en vain, mais chaque fois plus nombreuses, déjà rouges. —Puis, un beau jour au bout des belles années, les plis des poignets se distendirent et se décerclèrent. Elles purent passer une à une, se hâtant, et vers les lèvres, et vers les fronts s'éparpillèrent. Alors nous n'avons pu sourire sans qu'une marque en vint où couleraient des larmes. Elles pesèrent sur nos paupières, dans le sommeil, comme des barreaux; elles montèrent la garde, aux bords des yeux, traces de patte, comme si un oiseau de mort se fût posé près des prunelles, pour y boire ou les becqueter. Et elles circulent le long de notre corps—par deux, par file, par trois—curieuses, lentes et curieuses, comme un essaim de petites chenilles qui cherche où ronger.

Pennsylvania State University

LAURENT LESAGE

REVIEWS

Alfred Harbage, *Shakespeare and the Rival Traditions* (New York: Macmillan, 1952. xviii + 393 pp. \$6.00). THE importance of the distinction between 'public' and 'private' theatres in the Elizabethan and Jacobean years has long been recognized, but Professor Harbage here considers (with the thoroughness we expect of him) the size and character of the two audiences, the quality of the two repertoires: he rejoices that Shakespeare belonged to the public theatre, and has hard and challenging things to say on the writers for the children. It is evident that he views the acquisition of the Blackfriars as a disaster, or sure symptom of decline, for the King's Men. He tells us that much in his book 'that reads like judgment contains only description,' but his air of sturdy partisanship enlivens the enquiry and keeps the reader alert.

Apart, however, from the value-judgments that are always near the surface, Professor Harbage has demonstrated securely the relatively small size of the 'private' audience and the antinomian tendency discernible in its drama. At the turn of the century Marston's and Chap-

man's plays and the comical satires of Jonson have a new sharpness of savour, but here we are reminded that these were the products of a 'minority culture,' and that in Heywood and Dekker the public pulse was beating firmly yet. Not that a public faith was semi-privately denied: rather, the 'coterie' dramatists were careless and mocking and despondent, sometimes wishing to believe as the greater public did, sometimes finding an easy escape into the scabrous and the profane. Certainly, in considering the 'private' plays of the decade beginning in 1599, we are bound to recognize much validity in Professor Harbage's judgment. We must be aware of the strained savagery, the strained rebelliousness of Marston, often (as in *The Dutch Courtezan*) falling away into an unconvincing reassertion of common standards; of Jonson's incoherence in his plays for the boys; of the splendour of Chapman so clumsily harnessed, so cloudily refulgent. Jonson acquired stature when he turned to the adult players; and though we cannot forget Chapman's power, our stage finds no place for him or Marston. With these giants of the 'private' theatres, Professor Harbage contrasts the simple workmen with the larger audience—Heywood and Dekker and Chettle—who were wholesome in feeling and plain in statement. And Shakespeare too, we are told, preferred the general to the caviare it rejected. Based on his public's firm faith, his projection of human experience could be both more various and more generally recognisable. He had, in fact, the freedom of belonging, he avoided both pharisaism and a sense of persecution.

Of course, Professor Harbage will admit that he is generalising, that plays and dramatists passed from one type of theatre to the other and did not entirely change their characteristics in so doing. Yet, however frequently it is disavowed, the terminology of this book—'Theatre of a Nation,' 'Theatre of a Coterie,' 'Two Views of Life'—implies a hard-and-fast distinction which is with difficulty maintained. We are told that a popular audience would have been disturbed by 'Cutbeard's betrayal of Morose': we may wonder if it was actually disturbed (as indeed Jonson surely meant it to be) by Mosca's betrayal of Volpone, but Professor Harbage seems to imply that all Jonson's plays belonged in spirit to the 'coterie.' So, apparently, did Webster's, for we learn that the Red Bull public disliked *The White Devil* 'probably because Vittoria proved an unacceptable protagonist.' That same public—for no distinction is suggested between the audiences of the different public theatres—was always sound on the subject of revenge, never doubting its sinfulness. But if we want the most deliberate comment

on the evil of revenge, we shall go not to *Hamlet* but to *The Revenge of Bussy d'Ambois*, a 'private' play. Chapman sees, of course, the revenger's sense of obligation that goes along with his sense of evil, but that is part of the complexity of his outlook that Professor Harbage glides by: 'in Chapman's *Bussy D'Ambois* and *Charles Duke of Byron*,' he tells us, 'qualities that would be popularly construed as defects are paradoxically treated as heroical.' Yet nowhere in the drama of the time have we a clearer sense of the vanity of ambition, the rashness of self-confidence. Professor Harbage may, if he wishes, rebuke Chapman as insufficiently Christian, but he should not therefore present him as less clear-sighted than Bussy himself. Nor is it altogether easy to keep Shakespeare on the right side of the nation-coterie distinction. *Troilus* is explained as possibly a First Part of a two-part play, which would as a whole have cohered with the 'public' attitude, and in *Timon* 'Shakespeare himself seems unreconciled to his project'; but these are fetches indeed to make all neat. Shakespeare's outlook was surely broad enough to include a sceptical strain, generally subdued but at moments uneasily strong, just as his craftsmanship could lead him on occasion even to the Unities.

But all this is not to deny that there was a distinction, though perhaps a fluid one, between 'public' and 'private' dramatists, or that there were, for Shakespeare, immense advantages in belonging to the 'public' group. A special and valuable kind of honesty is encouraged if one addresses the largest audience within reach—provided always that, in doing so, one does not forsake one's personal idiom. And to win the favour of a large audience one must share, in general terms, its hopes and fears and postulates. What Professor Harbage overlooks, however, is that this sharing can never, for an artist of stature, be absolute. He will know the fragility of the everyday foothold, he will have a sharper sense of the precipice, he will not be altogether sure of the wisdom of continuing to climb. Giving fine expression to current sentiments, he may accept yet doubt them too. In this he is not disingenuous, for the scepticism will be the ground on which he builds. Professor Harbage rightly approves of using modern and popular analogies to bring out the nature of Shakespearian drama: he might therefore consider how, till recently, the film-public of the world rejoiced in the comedies of Mr. Chaplin, hardly aware of the feeling of deep solitude from which they came. We should welcome 'coterie' art (if we are to call it that) when it gives us Chapman or Ford or Congreve; we should welcome 'national' art when it makes Marlowe

or Shakespeare possible. But the great popular artist, unlike Heywood and Dekker, will never be quite at home.

Durham, England

CLIFFORD LEECH

John Arthos, *On "A Mask Presented at Ludlow-Castle"* (Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Press, 1954. x + 86 pp. \$2.00).

IN an age of specialization, even the critic, it seems, must be selective. Scholarship today, rather than attempting a complete estimation of even a single work (save in a once-in-a-lifetime variorum), tends to choose one aspect of that work and dwell on it with thoroughness. So it is with Professor Arthos' fine new study of *Comus*. He is interested in what may loosely be called the philosophical ideas of that poem. One looks in vain, for instance, for any mention of Milton's development of the masque form or of the celebration itself at Ludlow Castle. There is relatively little mention of Spenser's influence, and even the passages discussed in full are chosen with evident partiality: the opening soliloquy, for instance, is carefully and ably analyzed, but the fervent passage on the self-destructive power of evil is omitted. I am not implying that the study is in any sense inadequate about the facets of *Comus* with which it deals; but the facets do not make a whole diamond.

Professor Arthos divided his subject into three chapters. The first, "On the Power of the Sources," adequately covers the influence upon Milton of Homer's Circe, Peele's *Old Wives Tale*, and Fletcher's *Faithful Shepherdess*. Although there is little new in this chapter, it is a clear re-statement and re-evaluation of its subject.

Chapter II, "On the Artifice," is the shortest and weakest part of the book. Masques are indeed artificial. So is the pastoral. So is mythologizing. *Comus* suffers—if suffers is the right word—from all three. And yet we make allowances and despite Dr. Johnson enjoy the poem.

The third and last chapter, "On the Meaning," makes a real contribution to Miltonic scholarship. Carefully documented and thorough in its methods, this part of the study repays an intensive reading. The choice of subjects, as has been indicated, is selective, but Professor Arthos brings new information to bear on a number of details—on the daemonical background of the Attendant Spirit, for instance; or on the strong probability of the influence of Vigenère;

or on the meaning of the conclusion of the play; or in a stimulating analysis of the function of will and initiative in magic practices. He observes, I believe correctly, that "It is [of all the characters] the Lady whose vividness is necessary, and her bright image is achieved chiefly by her all but final individuality, her own complete possession of her will."

It is indeed a fine chapter, though it does not, of course, unravel all the problems implicit in its title. Its basic shortcoming is, I believe, the lack of a central idea which can hold together its various parts. Rather than a unified presentation of the meaning of *Comus*, it analyzes closely, but without much interrelationship, half-a-dozen different points. The result is some confusion and perhaps unnecessary obscurity. Its strength, on the other hand, is its author's evident integrity and careful scholarship. One might well paraphrase Dr. Johnson and conclude that its method is sound, and its aims are praiseworthy; but there is something wanting to allure attention.

Wofford College

WILLIAM B. HUNTER, JR.

Harold Jenkins, *Edward Benlowes (1602-1676): Biography of a Minor Poet* (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1952. x + 371 pp. \$6.00). THIS book, the fruit of much devoted and original research, is a valuable contribution to the history both of seventeenth-century poetry and of seventeenth-century England. Mr. Jenkins has convincingly demonstrated that it was not, as his friend Wood inferred, mere foolish improvidence which brought the inheritor of a splendid estate in Essex to the Oxford lodging where, in 1676, he died in extreme poverty at the age of seventy-four, but that the taxation and sequestration he suffered during and after the Civil War, which first brought him into debt, and the dishonest treatment he received from his confidential servant and from the City Merchant who purchased his estate, were the main causes of his ruin. Mr. Jenkins has spared no pains in tracing and studying all available evidence, including that of the long and complicated lawsuits in which poor Benlowes became involved. If at times, as in the account of the poet's foreign travels as a young man, paucity of fact is too much supplemented by imaginative reconstruction, there is also a great deal of interesting incidental information—about wages, for example, and about the comparative leniency in the enforcement of the laws against recusants (Benlowes's family were Catholics, although he himself abandoned this faith before he was twenty-five).

In his careful account of the production both of Benlowes's own books and of the share Benlowes took in the production of Phineas Fletcher's *Purple Island* and of Quarles's *Emblems* Mr. Jenkins has many new and important things to say. He states, for example, that it was Benlowes himself who presented to others copies of *The Purple Island* bearing his name, not, as Dr. Boas inferred, others who presented theirs to Benlowes; and he makes a very convincing case for the retention of the apparently eccentric typography of Benlowes's *Theophila*. In his description of one of Benlowes's youthful Latin exercise-books and in his remarks thereon ("this sort of thing developed in him a remarkable ability as well as liking for expressing a thought in a variety of ways," p. 25), in his description of a similar exercise-book whose blank leaves Benlowes later used for the writing out of thoughts and fancies which eventually found their way into *Theophila*, and in his account of Benlowes's "imitations," Mr. Jenkins does much to remind us that for the amateur poets of the seventeenth century (Donne and Marvell among them) poetry was not primarily and essentially "the spontaneous overflow of powerful feelings." Here, though, even Mr. Jenkins sometimes conveys the impression that he regards Benlowes's procedure (as distinct from his achievement) as more exceptional and eccentric than it really was. Benlowes, he says, "played with his treasured thoughts and fancies as with a jig-saw puzzle until he finally got them fitted in the pattern that pleased him best" (p. 124): can we not imagine Horace doing much the same with some of his odes? "To build up his poems by hints from a diversity of sources was a frequent method of composition. He had a good eye upon occasion and a daring turn of phrase, but he badly needed the initiative of another mind to stimulate activity in his own" (p. 122): subject to some qualification, one might almost say this of Marvell.

In his chapter on Benlowes's reading Mr. Jenkins rightly insists on his indebtedness (in common with so many other seventeenth-century poets) to Sylvester's *Du Bartas*. He quotes the famous passage about the woods being periwigged with snow (p. 113), but he might perhaps have added that the phrase "scaly Brood" in that passage was probably suggested by Sylvester, who has (I refer, for the sake of brevity, to the pages of the edition of 1621), "scaly crew" (p. 92), "scaly legions" (p. 100), "scaly nation" (p. 170) and "scaly folk" (p. 232). Benlowes might also equally well have derived the phrase "Deaths Serjeant" from Sylvester as from Hamlet:

And Death, drad Seriant of th' eternall Iudge (1621, p. 70):
That God revoak't his Serieant Death's sad Warrant (p. 89)

These, however, are small matters. Without making any excessive claims for Benlowes as a poet, Mr. Jenkins has enabled us to understand both him and seventeenth-century poetry in general better than we did before.

Oxford, England

J. B. LEISHMAN

John Wilson Bowyer, *The Celebrated Mrs. Centlivre* (Durham, North Carolina: Duke Univ. Press, 1952. xii + 267 pp.). SOME twelve years ago Prof. James Sutherland, in an article entitled "The Progress of Error: The Biographers of Mrs. Centlivre" (*RES*, XVIII), used an account of the successive biographies of Susanna Centlivre to point the moral that from meagre primary sources successive writers could erect a substantial edifice of mistaken information. He made it abundantly clear that a judicious biography, by someone who was willing to take the time to separate primary from secondary sources, was needed. There was indeed no question that Susanna Centlivre, one of the most popular dramatists of the eighteenth century, deserved a scholarly biography.

Professor Bowyer's *The Celebrated Mrs. Centlivre* is without doubt the best biography of its subject that has yet appeared. There is much new matter here, many new findings which are the result of long and careful investigation. Every reasonable clue that might lead to reliable information about Mrs. Centlivre's life and plays seems to have been followed, and backgrounds have been explored. The problem of the sources of Mrs. Centlivre's plays, to illustrate, is treated exhaustively, and often there is new information (cf. the treatment of the sources of *A Wife Well Manag'd*, pp. 165-166).

In one very important group of circumstances, those surrounding Mrs. Centlivre's birth, we are now in the curious position of being able to pass judgment from the vantage of assured knowledge on what was for Mr. Bowyer merely inference, and Mr. Bowyer comes off quite well. Mr. John H. Mackenzie, in an article published since Mr. Bowyer's book appeared (*N.Q.*, CXCVIII), announced the discovery of the record of Mrs. Centlivre's baptism: Susanna, the daughter of William Freeman and Anne, his wife, was baptized on November 20, 1669, in Whaplode, Lincolnshire. This record settles the disputes about the place and date of her birth, and even the identity of her father. On these points Mr. Bowyer could of course not be sure. About her place of birth he wrote (p. 4): "Since the parish rec-

ords of Holbeach [with which town Mrs. Centlivre was connected by several of her early biographers] make no mention of her, . . . it is probable that she was born elsewhere, possibly even in Ireland, and that the *Flying Post* merely assumed that she was a native as well as an early resident of the town." (Whaplode is a neighboring town to Holbeach.) On the other hand, Mr. Bowyer is almost precisely right about the date of her birth ("Susanna must have been born about 1670" [p. 6]), and he is inclined to accept Freeman as her father.

Any biographer of Mrs. Centlivre is necessarily embarrassed by the poverty of personal information preserved. Even with Mr. Bowyer's diligent combing of the London newspapers, not much has come to light. Mr. Bowyer therefore has to give most of his attention to the plays—their sources, merits, and stage histories—and this is of course not necessarily a bad thing. But it leads in this book to the introduction of irrelevancies. Little is gained by some of the details of stage history introduced (cf. p. 65); and it is difficult to see what is the purpose of the extensive plot summaries of each of Mrs. Centlivre's plays. For whom were they intended?

Mr. Bowyer is weakest in his critical judgments and in his treatment of critical problems. He gives no sustained attention to the changes in eighteenth-century comedy, of which Mrs. Centlivre's comedies are profoundly representative; and he sometimes oversimplifies early eighteenth-century critical positions (note, for example, his treatment of the problem of the didactic end of drama [pp. 58-59]). In discussing "sentimental drama" (pp. 61-62), Mr. Bowyer makes no use of such a relevant recent study as John Harrington Smith's *The Gay Couple in Restoration Comedy*.

There are faults in this book, I believe, and some of them serious. Yet Mr. Bowyer has brought together much new information about Mrs. Centlivre; and he has given us what will probably be the best biography of her to appear in our lifetime.

Stanford University

JOHN LOFTIS

David V. Erdman, *Blake: Prophet against Empire* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton Univ. Press, 1954. xx + 503 pp. \$7.50). IN a 1950 English Institute essay Professor Erdman wrote: "Blake always kept his visions oriented in time and space"; to him Time and Space were "Real Beings," and history was a very real, if "emblematic,"

texture. Blake, however, was not a trained historian and his vision of history was colored and limited by a "system" which eventually encompassed a great deal more than history, even man's very salvation. Professor Erdman is clearly aware of this and of Blake's peculiar perspective, that of a prophetic bard to whom a royal dragoon and William Pitt could assume equal significance. Consequently he did not intend to examine Blake's text line by line to reveal the complete history of his age, but rather to trace through "nearly all" of Blake's work a "more or less clearly discernible" thread of historical reference.

Actually the book accomplishes more, for the thread is at least threefold: (1) history from Lexington to Waterloo; (2) Blake's view of that history as a constant conflict between oppressor and oppressed, king and people, laws and the individual; and (3) Blake's self-censorship and the "tension between man and prophet." By extracting and bringing into focus the current allusions Professor Erdman reveals Blake's jubilation at America's revolt, his prophetic warnings to the king, his satisfaction at the outburst of French liberty and fraternity, his disillusion at the Peace of Amiens, his hatred of the Pitt ministry, the shattering of his bardic prophecies by the Napoleonic Wars, his retreat into the City of Art, and his final days of hope but little contentment. This would be enough to insure the book's value but Erdman goes on to relate this material to other components of Blake's complex visions. Only through such a synthesis is "the great crisis in Blake's vision of history" fully understandable: with Napoleon's threatened invasion and England's frenzied preparations for war, "How long could he [Blake] keep his 'quenchless rage' alive—or rather, how long his love: for that seemed the test, to continue to believe in brotherhood, which meant to fight for it in some way: how continue to love those who were dehumanized by Satan?" The tragic irony of his position became more and more poignant: the bold prophetic bard who thundered warnings that he believed could prostrate tyranny and overthrow armies was gagged by his fear of imprisonment. Like the audience of E. A. Robinson's "Cassandra," "None heeded, and few heard," or if they heard, none understood.

Essentially Professor Erdman's historical approach is made up of two main steps: (1) establishing the historical context by pinning down various kinds of internal evidence; (2) examining Blake's "hyperbole" to see what kind of literal statement the prophetic fire

can be reduced to. The identification of the context is usually convincing, but some of the translations of Blake's "ornamental periphrasis" into "ordinary language" are questionable. A fair example is the reading of the "Argument" of *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell*, in which the "just man" becomes the "meek peasant," the "perilous path" along the "vale of death" becomes "the feudal shadows of death," the planting of roses becomes "a fair harvest," the "villain" and "sneaking serpent" become "aristocrats and priests" agitating for "counterrevolution." The resulting interpretation largely ignores the fact that "The Argument" is an integral part of, as well as a preface to, *The Marriage*. Similarly Erdman reads "The Couch of Death" as a plague document with social and political overtones and yet the selection mentions no plague, famine, tyranny, or historical background. The section on *An Island in the Moon*, though interesting, is highly conjectural (but more convincing than the equally supposititious reading of *Tiriel*), and the use of Godwin's diary is both tedious and largely unhelpful: only one of Godwin's Blakes is surely William. Finally, Professor Erdman's exegetical giant steps are extremely difficult to follow, leaping as they do by series of brief quotations through many lines, even pages of Blake's poetry.

Though such difficulties do not invalidate Erdman's approach, they are symptomatic of its dangers. More serious than these, perhaps, is the misinterpretation of Blake's state of innocence. Erdman believes that in 1787-1789 Blake, prompted by an interlude of peace and prosperity in England and by the death of his brother Robert, abandoned his earlier cynicism in favor of "a cultivated state of inner warmth," innocence, to warm the hearts of all men. But the innocence of *Songs of Innocence* is not consciously cultivated at all; it is a "natural" state of ignorance (symbolized by the free, uninhibited, irresponsible play of children). The "organized Innocence" which Erdman rightly says "springs out of Experience" is implicit in the songs, but becomes explicit only in *Jerusalem* and *Milton*; it is a state of wise innocence attained only by leaving behind the innocence of the songs, facing up to experience (*Songs of Experience*), casting off Error (selfhood, Satan), and thus reuniting with the Divine Body of Imagination in eternal brotherhood. The reintegration is Blake's Eden. Some understanding of this system leads Professor Erdman to establish fraternity as the moving force in Blake's view of the French Revolution; but his description of the blissful result of that revolution

as a "new Eden of experience" only muddles Blake's clear conception of the millenium as a state of "organized innocence." Blake's entire system may not always be clear, to be sure, but it must be examined in his terms.

The very real value of the book lies in its extensive documentation from the literature, art, and life of the day, its puncturing of many legends, its contribution to biography, its uncovering of many hitherto unknown "sources," its sensitive appreciation of Blake's poetic and prophetic technique, and above all its clarification of Blake's intent. The result is a major contribution to our understanding of all of Blake's works, particularly *King Edward the Third*, *Visions of the Daughters of Albion*, *America*, *The French Revolution*, *Europe*, "The Grey Monk," and *The Four Zoas*.

University of Wisconsin

ROBERT F. GLECKNER

Abbie Findlay Potts, *Wordsworth's Prelude: A Study of Its Literary Form* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell Univ. Press, 1953. xii + 392 pp. \$6.00).

PROFESSOR Potts's extraordinary and searching study of Wordsworth's *Prelude* will certainly not serve as an introduction to his poetry for readers not already steeped in it and convinced of his greatness. It is a book for literary specialists well-versed in the tradition of English poetry. In the temple of Wordsworth's thought Miss Potts stands with the reverence of a devotee in a crypt before the bones of saints and apostles. Her comments on details of his art are as subtle, ingenious and learned as those of a connoisseur among the windows and figured portals of Chartres. Her patience in reconstructing the past is as tireless as that of an archaeologist among the ruins of buried cities. There is an old-world quaintness and charm about her style. Her work as a whole may well mark something like a revolution in the world's view of this poet. Her conclusions are impressive and for the most part convincing. But to make them accessible to the general reader will require the labor of scholars capable of following her blazed trail through all its windings, but at the same time of cutting broad and straight ways through the flowering jungle of her speculations.

Miss Potts's aim is to characterize the *Prelude* as to literary type and function; and through the fragmentary manuscripts published by de Selincourt, as well as through early poems such as "Lines . . . on the Wye" ("Tintern Abbey"), to trace the evolution of his literary

intention from its earliest conception to its completed form in the 1805-6 text. In pursuing this aim she passes in review all the traditional types of poem and narrative as they were adapted from the theory and practice of the ancients by the great body of English writers with whom Wordsworth was familiar from early youth, and as he himself distinguishes them in the Preface to the 1815 collected edition of his poems. But what occupies the main body of her work is a detailed comparison of Wordsworth's method, his ideas, vocabulary and figurative language, with those of English writers of the eighteenth and seventeenth centuries, so as to bring out "literary analogies," or more often, to argue direct "literary inheritance." In the tracing of "sources," her actual claims are modest and discreet; and whenever she discovers a borrowing or likeness, she is careful to note the modifications produced in Wordsworth's context by his temperamental idiosyncrasy and the novelty of his frame of reference. But the final effect of her eternal parallels might well be to give an incautious reader the impression that the substance and form of Wordsworth's writing were entirely derived from earlier writers. What she has at any rate made abundantly clear to a reader of any degree of initiation is that, in spite of his fine originality, Wordsworth is one of the most dyed-in-the-wool literary and traditional of English poets.

She leaves no doubt, for example, that his "first teacher of English composition" was Alexander Pope; and she argues with some plausibility that the *Prelude* was, among other things and in its own way, an Epistle in the manner of Pope. Wordsworth's "character" of Minstrel she traces largely to Beattie's poem, of Shepherd Swain to Thomson's *Seasons*, of Pilgrim to Bunyan, of Scholar to Chaucer and Spenser, of Man of Science to Dr. Akenside, of Philanthropist to Young in his *Night Thoughts*—the *Prelude* being, like the earlier poem, a "Christian Triumph." And for the general educative, didactic and moral purpose of the poem, she very plausibly suggests the influence of Plato's Proemium to the *Laws* and of Bacon's *Advancement of Learning*. For verbal resemblances this scholar has the sharp eye of a mother-bird on a limb scouting for worms and insects. And while many of the resemblances she notes are such as would seem inevitable in writers dealing with similar subjects, it is generally hard to resist the cumulative evidence of positive filiation in the case of writers whom Wordsworth is known to have revered and conned with sedulous care.

It is refreshing to read a whole book on Wordsworth in which no remote allusion is made to the vices of romanticism and the kind of guilt by association that was attributed to this poet some generations ago by "Humanists" like Irving Babbitt or more recently by disciples of a more sophisticated school of criticism. It is also a relief to find a scholar who takes no part in the anxious debate that has long raged over the correctness of Wordsworth's theological views. In this Miss Potts displays an artful ingenuousness that has a piquant literary flavor of its own; or she may simply be one of those happy spirits who can take for granted the essentials of religious feeling without growing heated over points of dogmatic formulation. In any case she is strongly intrenched in her position of one concerned primarily with *literary* intentions, and favored by her realization that much of what passes for theology is poetic machinery or "mythos." Throughout her discussion she keeps returning to Wordsworth's main theme in the poem, which was "Imagination, How Impaired and Restored." She believes that in the "action" of the *Prelude* he was broadly following the model of Milton in *Paradise Lost* and *Paradise Regained*; for both he and Coleridge clearly understood that the story of the *Prelude* involved, like Milton's, a "redemptive" process. But Wordsworth's poet was not Milton's Adam. "Milton's theology would not serve him as a frame of reference. . . . He would need new 'machinery'." In his plot the "conflicts and wanderings are to be represented as the conflicts and wanderings of a man—not of angels and demons, still less of superhuman, subhuman, or ahuman monsters. . . . Nature has taken the place of archangels and redeemer. The assumed rigor of God and His angels has made way for the assumed kindness of Nature. The torments of hell and the agony of redemption are modified into the ordeals of the spiritual life."

Thus it is that Miss Potts operates to disarm theologians or keep them at a distance. And this is but one of innumerable passages in which she exhibits the means by which the intense ethical seriousness of Wordsworth is poetically implemented and his "criticism of life" rendered in esthetic terms. This is more literary science than it is literary criticism. But it may well serve as the substantial basis for a new critical evaluation of Wordsworth whenever a modern Arnold or Coleridge appears to take full advantage of this scholar's important findings.

University of Minnesota

JOSEPH WARREN BEACH

Leo Villiger, *Catharina Regina von Greiffenberg (1633-1694), zu Sprache und Welt der barocken Dichterin* (Zurich: Atlantis Verlag, 1952. 110 pp. *Zürcher Beiträge zur deutschen Sprach- und Stilgeschichte*, 5).

BACK in 1871 when the term "baroque" had not yet been applied to the literature of the 17th century, Carl Lemcke stated unequivocally that beside Gryphius Catharina Regina von Greiffenberg was the most important German poet of the age. Villiger has here done a good and commendable job of reintroducing her.

Briefly, in twenty-four pages, he reviews her biography and places her work in its proper setting. While this part leans on Uhde-Bernays' account of fifty years ago, the next sixty-odd pages deal intelligently and critically, though not always in as simple language as one might wish, with such subjects as Catharina Regina's language (in an aesthetic rather than a philological approach); her attitude toward colors and sounds; her excess of expression and her attitude toward words as such; her playfulness. After dealing with the *wherewithal* of her poetry Villiger discusses the *how* of it: concreteness of expression; ordo; dichotomy, etc. In the last chapter he analyzes the *what* of her poetry: man, God, and the possibility of union between them.

Since the works of Catharina Regina are only very incompletely available, we are indebted to Villiger for appending a scant but representative selection of twenty poems which designedly avoids duplicating those contained in the anthologies of Cysarz and Wehrli. Though far from sufficient, these selections will have to satisfy us and our graduate students for some time to come.

The bibliographical information is complete, but of special importance only as it concerns the Greiffenberg source material. However, the fact that *Des . . . Leidens und Sterbens Christi zwölf andächtige Betrachtungen*, located in Göttingen, was not used by Villiger is inexcusable in this age of photocopying.

Villiger's statements are informed and informative without displaying the air of self-importance so often found in German scholarship, particularly the parts of it dealing with the baroque.

University of Texas

G. SCHULZ-BEHREND

Adolf Rapp, ed., *Briefwechsel zwischen Strauss und Vischer, Zweiter Band, 1851-1873* (Stuttgart: Ernst Klett, 1953. 356 pp. *Veröffentlichungen der Deutschen Schillergesellschaft*, ed. E. Ackerknecht, 19). THIS volume, completing the correspondence (see *MLN*, LXVIII

[1953], 180) spans the years from 1851 to 1873—i. e., the time of the German era of reaction and unification. It should again prove interesting to the historian as well as to the student of literature. Vischer's sympathies, as those of a fervent democrat, are *großdeutsch*. Strauß, expecting nothing from Austria and the South German *Kleinstaaterei*, respects Prussia's vigor and ability, and hopes from her a rescue from the German political misery. Due to the intransigence of both correspondents, there are shorter and longer intervals in their exchange of letters. They both accuse each other of being dictatorial, and it is tragic that just when their views are beginning to grow more compatible, discontent with their surroundings, domestic troubles and physical infirmities have worn down their vitality too seriously for a resumption of their lifelong friendship.

However, in fields other than political we can observe a growing friction between them. Vischer, for instance, prefers Shakespeare to Schiller and Goethe; Strauß upbraids him for his lack of respect and understanding for *Faust* and *Hermann and Dorothea* and their author. There is an interesting sidelight on Hermann Grimm's disclosure of the mystery of Suleika and Marianne von Willemer. Both correspondents are united in their affection for Mörike, but Vischer is impatient with the latter's retreat from the world, seclusion and restriction of interests. His reactions are always violent, often lopsided, while Strauß has the finer sensitivity and receptivity for poetry, the greater compass of reading in it. In their fight against bigotry they second each other, encourage each other in their literary labors and criticise each other's works with understanding until their final breach occurs over Strauß' *New Faith*.

The volume contains two portraits and two facsimiles, characteristic for their authors (Vischer's "Urweltballade" in the manner of Scheffel, and Strauß' lovely lyric "Wem ich dieses klage . . ."), beside an excellent chronological bibliography of their works and the index for both volumes. The layman might have welcomed references for direct or veiled quotations of the correspondents, but otherwise the editorial work seems even more skillfully done than in the first volume, especially in the dexterous resums of omitted letters and in the choice of illuminating passages from letters of other friends.

The Johns Hopkins University

ERNST FEISE

Michele Barbi, *Life of Dante*, tr. and ed. P. G. Ruggiers (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1954. x + 132 pp. \$3.00). Dante Alighieri, *The Purgatorio from the Divine Comedy*, tr. Sydney Fowler Wright (Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1954. ix + 147 pp. 10s. 6d.). THESE two translations are more evidence of the increasing interest in Dante among non-specialists.

The English-speaking reader will welcome the translation of Barbi's short but dense classic on Dante's life and works. Although the original appeared a generation ago, first in the *Enciclopedia Italiana* (Rome, 1929) and then in book form (*Dante: Vita, opere e fortuna* [Florence, 1933]), the basic facts synthesized so admirably by Barbi have since changed little if at all. Barbi's sober critical observations, moreover, may still provide excellent orientation for the student of Dante. In keeping with his purpose, Mr. Ruggiers has substituted for Barbi's bibliography an up-to-date, comprehensive selection of useful works in English. He has kept his helpful "Translator's Notes" to a minimum.

The translation is, on the whole, competent and readable, with here and there an exceptionally happy rendering. The more unwieldy Italian periods have wisely been chopped up and simplified for clarity of English style. Mr. Ruggiers' effort towards readability, though, has occasionally alienated him from the careful nuancing and emphasis of the original. Certain liberties of translation as well as the omission of several qualifying words and phrases of Barbi's text produce discrepancies, which, in their cumulative effect, tend to contradict the translator's aim expressed in the preface of taking "few liberties with the translation," of rendering Barbi's Italian "as closely as possible."

Some of the more conspicuous discrepancies are cited here, with suggested corrections: p. 37—for "More than any other work" read "To more than anything else"; p. 38—for "their abandoned goods" read "their dear ones left behind"; pp. 38 and 41—for "piteous lady" read "compassionate lady" (as *donna pietosa* is correctly translated on other pages); p. 39—for "extraordinary lyrics" read "unattached lyrics" (cf. correct rendering on p. 40: "'unattached' poems"); p. 71—for "'upon the right path' to love, the highest good" read "'upon the right path,' to love the highest good"; p. 72—for "style itself led to an early division of the work" read "subject-matter" in place of "style"; p. 77—for "most anxious" read "even though anxious"; p. 86—for "the Serpents" read "the Ser-

pent"; p. 112—for "Baldassarre" read "Baldassare"; p. 114—for "here Dante became the object of the most precise appraisals and the most intensive studies" read "here too Dante became the object of more precise appraisals and more rigorous studies"; p. 115—for "It was through Wegele that a branch of the Dante Society was founded at Dresden in 1865" read "Finally, this interest in Dante studies was centered in the German Dante Society founded at Dresden in 1865."

Despite these inaccuracies, it may be seen that, on the whole, the usefulness of Mr. Ruggiers' translation is not too seriously impaired. *Barbi's Life of Dante*, as an introduction to the poet, may well take its place beside another excellent tool, dealing with special topics and problems—namely, Umberto Cosmo's *Handbook to Dante Studies* (tr. David Moore [Oxford, 1950]), listed also by Mr. Ruggiers in his bibliography.

Mr. Wright's *Purgatorio* poses anew the perennial problem of what are to be the precise function and requirements of the translation of a poetic masterpiece. In the case of Dante's *Divine Comedy*, unique in its special combination of general conception, artistic construction and texture, there can never be any adequate substitute for the original. If substitution there must be, in this reviewer's opinion, the most faithful and satisfactory rendering of Dante's poem will be an exact, near-literal one, such as is possible perhaps only in prose—John Sinclair's version is now the best—with its relative freedom of the inevitably distorting strictures of verse. However, the lure of a verse translation has always proved irresistible, and probably one is not entirely wrong in hoping that it may continue so.

The present translator, a poet in his own right, offers the *Purgatorio* in decasyllabic blank verse, varied by occasional, irregular and unobtrusive rhyme. Those who enjoyed his *Inferno* (New York, Cosmopolitan Book Corporation, 1928) will now enjoy his *Purgatorio*. Mr. Wright's version reads well, in general, and can provide much pleasure to one who must remain content with something less than Dante's original poem.

Harvard University

ANTHONY L. PELLEGRINI

W. L. Wiley, *The Gentleman in Renaissance France* (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1954. xii + 303 pp.). THE Renaissance cult of the Gentleman had its own hagiography, starting way back

with the knightly Cadmus, son of Agenor, who brought culture from Phoenicia to Europe and made "civilized men of boors," as Alciati put it.¹ Its golden legend included great names from Hector down to Pierre Terrail, without fear and without reproach, who as the Chevalier Bayard knighted his own monarch on the battlefield, and Baldassare Castiglione at whose death Carlos Quinto sighed, "I tell you that one of the finest gentlemen in the world has passed away." The cult had its sacred books, the earliest of which was the *Aeneid*, which taught polished Augustan manners, in opposition to the uncouth society depicted in the *Odyssey* and the *Iliad*.² The cult was abundantly provided with catechisms, drawn up by such high priests as Stefano Guazzo, Giovanni della Casa, Thomas Lyly, Richard Braithwaite, and Castiglione himself, author of the *Cortegiano*. The French catechisms and *regulae* came later: Du Souhait's *Parfait Gentilhomme* in 1600, Nicolas Pasquier's *Gentilhomme* in 1611, and Nicolas Faret's *Honneste homme* in 1630. The cult also had its own iconography, as we shall show below.

It is by way of a paradox that whereas the manuals on civility were less numerous in France of the sixteenth century than in Italy, England, or even Spain, the gentlemanly way of life was as highly codified and observed as anywhere by the inhabitants of such architectural masterpieces as Azay-le-Rideau and Chenonceaux. In France courtliness was borne along not so much by treatises as by letters, memoirs, paternal counsels, traditions, written and unwritten laws. An entrenched sense of correctness kept gentlemen and commoners apart and assigned separate mores to each class. If a gentleman rode up to the scene of a duel, for example, his mount was confiscated by the marshals; if a commoner rode alongside to watch, he lost an ear. Lest the newly-rich bourgeois dress and adorn himself like a nobleman, "edicts had to be passed from time to time to prevent him from looking too much like a gentleman."

Wiley's brilliant and readable book sheds light on the whole question of gentility and civility in France, a tradition which he claims was more short-lived than we have expected. "The Renaissance gentleman really came into being in the few years leading up to the coronation of Francis I in 1515, and he expired in the civil strife that broke out in the 1560's during the reign of Charles IX." If one

¹ Andrea Alciati, *Emblemata* (Paris, 1589), p. 640.

² The contrast between the civilized Vergil and the primitive Homer comes out clearly in Scaliger's discussion of the epic in his *Poetics*.

objects that after the 1560's there were some extremely important courtesy books—by Timotei, Muzio, Ascham, Peacham, Du Souhait, Nervèse, and others—Wiley's answer is that at least in France these tended to teach one to get along at court rather than to live up to a code of gentility. His second, and to us more cogent, answer is that changing political and socio-economic conditions prevented the golden age of the Gentleman from extending past the sixteenth century.

To be sure, the question which Wiley explores is a tremendous one, ranging from the Aristotelian analysis of *vertu* down to such questions of genteel superstition as to whether it is unfair for a duelist to wear an amulet. The theoretical and conceptual side of courtliness is carefully reviewed, not forgetting the somewhat elastic dividing line between nobility of birth and nobility of soul, which has such crucial importance for an understanding of Renaissance art and literature, influenced as they were by the preoccupation of Aristotle and Longinus on the *ψος*. "The French found it easier to measure a gentleman by his inherited position and his family than by trying to decide what qualities he should have inside him." True nobility had to be attested by coats-of-arms authenticated for four generations. And yet even if a gentleman could boast of more than Candide's threescore-and-eleven quarters, there were beside certain formal devotions of the cult to be observed. In the bellicose sixteenth century, gentlemen had to "provide leadership and inspiration for victory in the field," even against such unsportsmanlike inventions as artillery. In wartime one had to observe amenities, and the Duc de Nemours could take a cordial morning stroll with Spanish officers shortly before being killed by their men in battle. If one captured a particularly valiant enemy, one should free him, as Lodovico Sforza released Bayard. Gentlemen had to joust, train falcons, hunt the stag and boar, dance, play at *paume*, and divert the ladies, never being bested in these by anyone of lower station. One had to accord hospitality to one's king, and many a gentleman must have had a sinking feeling on hearing that the ubiquitous Francis I, with a retinue of 18,000 men and 12,000 horses, was headed his way.

Like the *honnête homme*, the *gentilhomme* tended to steer a middle course on social and intellectual issues. Women should be allowed a bit more freedom, but the double standard was still best. As for the religious wars, "it was much easier and more natural for a gentleman to be a Catholic than a Protestant during the Renaissance." Ronsard's "Remonstrance au peuple de France" was a jolly good

answer to that noisy voice of Luther "denouncing the polished and cultivated gentleman who loved the arts and polite entertainment, the patron of Raphael and the builder of St. Peter's in Rome." Everyone knew that Italy was a more civilized place than Germany, where the peasants, by the way, seemed to be getting out of control. The owning and reading of books was desirable, of course, but our French gentleman "was more at ease outdoors with a horse and indoors with a woman than with a book in either place." The new revival of learning was very fine, and one should encourage it even financially, but people must not start rejecting such proved sciences as astrology. Had not Nostradamus prognosticated the death of Henri II seven years ahead of the sad event? All this literary turmoil and writing of sonnets to win over an obdurate lady was all right, but any enlightened man of the world knew that a more successful way was to have her served the genitals of a cockerel at supper.

It becomes apparent that Wiley develops lengthily the practices of *cortegiania* in France, as well as extracting its principles. One area of underlying theory neglected by Wiley deserves brief comment here. The Renaissance vogue of emblems and devices was a sustaining force to the gentlemanly mode of life. Henry Estienne, after Ammirato, wrote that "as some define Poetry to be a Philosophy of Philosophers, that is to say a delightful meditation of the learned: so we may call a Devise the Philosophie of Cavaliers." The devices served many purposes: as emblems of nobility and as the iconographical staples of courtly life: pageantry, jousts, state funerals, coronations, and other ceremonies. In his *Philosophie des images*, Menestrier made it clear that devices and emblems should be cultivated by the gentleman: by the "personnes de qualité," "personnes de premier ordre," "personnes d'esprit," including the king. In his *Compleat Gentleman*, Henry Peacham advised the courtier to adorn his conversation "with conceits of wit and pleasant invention, as ingenious Epigrams, Emblems, Anagrams, marrie tales, wittie questions and answers." To the Elizabethan, emblem writing was an essential part of the training of the courtier: "a gentlemanly accomplishment of the same type as the ability to play the lute or dance the lavolta."³

This curious relationship between the device or emblem and the gentlemanly tradition is certainly worthy of further study. Many an emblem book in France and elsewhere was designed to educate individual princes and noblemen: André Barenger's *Guide fidèle de*

³ Rosemary Freeman, *English Emblem Books* (London, 1948), p. 3.

la vraie gloire, Ambrogio Marliani's *Theatrum politicum*, Saavedra Faxardo's *Idea de un Príncipe político christiano*, Pierre Le Moyne's *Art de régner*, Giulio Cesare Capaccio's *Principe*. A final evidence that the emblem movement was a sustaining force is that the emblematists themselves were writing tracts defining the perfect courtier: typical were the *Miroir politique* of Guillaume de la Perrière, *The Compleat Gentleman* of Henry Peacham, and the *Civil conversazione* of Stefano Guazzo. Similarly, Berlingiero Gessi's *Spada di onore* was an emblem book. We shall return to this matter in a forthcoming article.⁴

Written with sympathy and humor, well organized, and richly documented, Wiley's book is valuable for the illumination it will inevitably cast on Renaissance life, literature, and art. We may now understand more fully Ronsard's triumphal ode to Jarnac, D'Aubigné's satires on the *mignons* of the royal court, Rabelais's attacks on women, and Du Bellay's invective against the courtier poets. We understand better those influential patrons who constituted the Maecenate of Renaissance letters and arts.⁵

New York University

ROBERT J. CLEMENTS

Benoit, *Chronique des ducs de Normandie, Vol. II*, ed. Carin Fahlin (Uppsala, 1954. 641 pp. Bibliotheca Ekmaniana, 60). VOLUME II of Miss Fahlin's edition contains the second half of Benoit's lengthy chronicle (lines 21933-44544). The dukes of Normandy whose lives

⁴ R. J. Clements, "Princes and Literature: A Theme of Renaissance Emblem Books," *Modern Language Quarterly*, forthcoming.

⁵ Three points must be made in conclusion: (1) Wiley twice mentions the "Spanish commander" whose forces dealt Bayard a mortal blow. This nobleman, Ferrante, Marquis of Pescara, was the husband of the brilliant Vittoria Colonna. That poetess and connoisseur of gentility (she read the *Cortegiano* in manuscript form before it was published) hailed her husband as a Hector and Achilles of "gran virtù." Ferrante irritated his fellow-Italians by declaring that he would have rather been born in Spain than in Italy, so that he would not have resented the nationality Wiley gives him. (2) Wiley claims that Scaliger felt Nostradamus to be endowed with supernatural powers. However, see Scaliger, *Poemata* (1591) I, 119, 222, and 447, which reveal that Scaliger was by no means taken in by his erstwhile fellow-townsmen. (3) The Renaissance was addicted to setting up protagonist-antagonist dualisms. To the dictator of Machiavelli was contrasted the anti-dictator of La Boétie, and so on. In discussing the *Querelle des femmes*, Wiley might have mentioned the vogue of the *Contr'Amours* in Renaissance France, cruel attacks indulged in by the best writers. Then, too, there were the *contre-courtisanes*, superbly epitomised by Falstaff.

provide the subject-matter for this section of the poem are Richard I, II, and III, Robert, William the Conqueror and his three sons.

Miss Fahlin's interest in Benoit dates back to the time of her doctoral dissertation (University of Uppsala, 1937), the subject of which was a paleographic and linguistic evaluation of MS 903 of the Municipal Library of Tours. Among the points made by her at that time: (1) the Tours Manuscript, since it can be dated as belonging to the years 1180-1200, may be the oldest manuscript still in existence which contains an Old-French text of any length transcribed on the Continent; (2) it presents an admixture of western and southwestern dialectal traits which locate it within an area (southern Touraine, Poitou, Aunis, Saintonge, Angoumois) whose exact linguistic status during the twelfth century still needs additional clarification despite the research of Boucherie, Görlich, M. K. Pope, Gamillscheg, La Du, Teodora Scharten, and other scholars; (3) it reflects the language of Benoit more faithfully than Harley 1717, the British Museum manuscript which Francisque Michel, the previous editor of the Chronicle, chose as his base.

In 1951 Miss Fahlin brought out the first volume (Bibliotheca Ekmaniana, 56) of the *Chronique des ducs de Normandie*. A third volume, still to be published, will contain the notes to the text, glossaries, an analysis of the language of the author (as distinguished from that of the three scribes of the Tours Manuscript), and a re-examination of the problem of whether Benoit, author of the Chronicle, is to be equated with Benoit de Sainte-Maure, to whom we owe the *Roman de Troie* (in her dissertation Miss Fahlin favors such a view).

The text of the Chronicle, as constituted by Miss Fahlin, gives every evidence of the most competent editorship. She has been helped, as she herself handsomely recognizes (Vol. I, p. v), not only by the Michel edition, but also by the work of a number of scholars, especially Hugo Andresen, who, in addition to editing Wace's *Rou*, has analyzed the sources of Benoit's chronicle and offered a long list of suggestions for correcting and emending the text printed by Michel. But there is no doubt that Miss Fahlin understands the special problems of editing the Benoit text much better than either Michel or Andresen did. I base this conviction on an examination of the textual comments made by Andresen (ZRPh 11 [1887] 352-370) in regard to that part of the Chronicle which Miss Fahlin includes in her second volume. The extent of her discernment is apparent in the way she accepts, modifies or rejects an Andresen correction or emendation.

Since she is editing a text of historical interest, Miss Fahlin has wished to make it accessible to historians. "Pour ne pas rebuter les amateurs d'histoire de France, nous avons souvent corrigé les graphies qui auraient pu dérouter les lecteurs non-spécialisés, tout en indiquant toujours les corrections apportées au ms base en bas de la page." And yet she admits on the same page (Vol. I, p. viii) that this helpful procedure may tend to obscure the dialectical coloring of the Tours Manuscript. Thus, relegated to the bottom of the page, we find the following spellings which probably point to southern or Provençal influences: *cen* (cent) 38169; *d'eviron* or *de viron* (d'environ) 23061; *e* (en) 23398, 33359, 37556; *es* (est) 22219, 22640, 23783, 23894, 25713; *no* (non) 35023; *on* (onc) 23226, 23280, 23501, 25517, 25520, 32825 (yet *om* is kept in line 38047: C'om pucele nen oct meillor corage); *pascha* (pasche) 40967; *pus* (plus) 36215, 36628, 38284. It may seem somewhat ironical that, after emphasizing in her dissertation the distinctive linguistic features of the Tours Manuscript, Miss Fahlin should later be led to reject several spellings and forms judged too difficult for the average reader of Old French.

Benoit's Chronicle ends with the burial at Reading of Henry Beauclerc. As published by Miss Fahlin, the final lines of the poem have the following appearance:

A Radinges voleit gesir,
44536 La fist son cors ensevelir,
La gist en riche sepulture;
E l'alme, bele e clere e pure,
Est devant Deu, ou ele atent
44540 Le glorios coronement
Que cil durablement avront
Qui ensemble od lui regneront
Cum angelis in eternum
Per secula seculorum. Amen.

Perhaps it would have been better to locate *Amen* below *Per secula seculorum*, thus making it quite clear that *Per secula seculorum* is an octosyllabic line which rhymes with *Cum angelis in eternum* (cf. Jane Beardwood, *Rhymes of Latin and French Words in Old French* [Philadelphia, 1930], p. 57). Also a 44544 could have been placed opposite *Per secula seculorum*.

Princeton University

ALFRED FOULET

y
m

la
an
ne
a-
te

tes

has
les
nies
ant
re."
ful
urs
ind
acal
61;
894,
520,
llor
884.
ser-
ipt,
rms
nry
pem

cula
an
ane
ila-
site

ET

ptes

THE FINER TONE

KEATS' MAJOR POEMS

By EARL R. WASSERMAN

Mr. Wasserman's perceptive reading of the poems combines an intimate knowledge of Keats' works, including his letters, with the most rewarding and salutary approaches that have been developed in recent criticism. Texts of five of the poems — *Ode on a Grecian Urn*, *La Belle Dame Sans Merci*, *The Eve of St. Agnes*, *Lamia*, and *Ode to a Nightingale* — are included.

"The sensitive and perceptive studies that make up [this book] are almost a model of the way in which the explication-of-the-text method should be applied to one of the great Romantic Poets." — W. J. Bate.

1953

236 pp.

\$4.00



The Johns Hopkins Press

HOMEWOOD • BALTIMORE 18 • MARYLAND



JAMES C. McLAREN



THE THEATRE OF ANDRÉ GIDE

Evolution of a Moral Philosopher

This first complete study of Gide's theatre considers his plays and dialogues as psychological documents which reveal more accurately than any other genre the succeeding phases of his development as moral philosopher and esthetician.

The dramatic form is naturally suited to an externalization of Gide's moral conflict, and the protagonists of his theatre represent the participants in a constantly changing inner dialogue of moral extremes.

1953

127 pages

\$3.00



The Johns Hopkins Press

HOMEWOOD • BALTIMORE 18 • MARYLAND

Announcing a brilliant new
BEGINNING COLLEGE GRAMMAR
FIRST YEAR FRENCH

by
CARL L. JOHNSON, UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

Here is a sound book with a fillip of true French elegance and charm. The readings are refreshingly mature. Even the exercises are sprightly and bright. *First Year French* clearly explains every important principle of grammar, following the usage of the educated Frenchman of 1955. Photographs, drawings, and maps are an integral part of this strikingly beautiful book.



PUBLISHERS OF BETTER BOOKS FOR BETTER TEACHING

D. C. HEATH AND COMPANY

Sales Offices: New York 14 Chicago 16 San Francisco 5
Atlanta 3 Dallas 1 Home Office: Boston 16

THE HARMONIOUS VISION

by DON CAMERON ALLEN

One of the central poetic topics that engaged the imagination of John Milton was that of the vision given to man when he had put his own inner music in harmony with that of God. In *THE HARMONIOUS VISION* this theme becomes an important means of explicating some of Milton's poetry and of understanding his artistic intent.

As Allen leads the reader through Milton's poetry, he shows the twin development of Milton as a poet, and of the idea of the "harmonious vision" in the poetry itself.

In the Fall, the harmonious vision is lost, but it can be won again. Towards its recapture, Milton, true son of Eve, expended the full powers of his poetic life.

The book comprises six essays, written in a scholarly yet engaging style. In this new reading of the great poet, Don Cameron Allen has produced a book which the publishers believe will be of utmost importance to Miltonists, and all serious students of poetry.

146 pages

Index

\$3.00



The Johns Hopkins Press

HOMEWOOD • BALTIMORE 18 • MARYLAND